



THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 1.—JANUARY—1917.

I.

PHILIP SCHAFF, THE ADVOCATE OF THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

DAVID SCHLEY SCHAFF.

On the tablet placed to the memory of Dr. Schaff on the walls of Union Theological Seminary are inscribed the words:

"Exegete and Church Historian. President of the American Committee of Bible Revision. He advocated the Reunion of Christendom."

The active promotion of the cause of the reunion of Christendom is the feature of his career which attracts the attention of this gathering¹ and is to find embodiment in the building with which it is proposed to do Dr. Schaff the honor of associating his name.

A warm Christian faith and a Catholic habit of mind made it possible for Dr. Schaff to espouse with earnestness this great cause of Christian union and to promote it by his own personality as well as by his words and writings.

To the formation of this Catholic habit of mind his place of birth, his theological training and his transition to this country alike contributed.

¹ This paper was delivered as an address in Horticultural Hall, Philadelphia, during "the Schaff Civic Week," November 27, 1916.

"I am a Swiss by birth," he used to say, "a German by education and an American by choice." He regarded Switzerland as the hearthstone of civil liberty and the "most beautiful country in the world." Zwingli and Calvin who labored on Swiss soil, he affirmed, did as much as Luther and Melancthon in forming the ideas and principles which control the history of modern times. Gallatin, Agassiz and Guyot, he was pleased to recall, were contributions of his native country to American life.

A certain love of free institutions taken in with his first breath, enabled him on his arrival in this land of his adoption to fall in by conviction with our American institutions and to prefer in practise America to any other country in the world.

In succession, he attended the universities of Tübingen, Halle and Berlin, then the most active centres of theological thought in Germany. At Tübingen, he came into contact with Baur and Ewald, the one shaking the theological world by his criticism of the Apostolic literature and the reconstruction of the primitive church, the other about to gain fame as the expositor of Hebrew literature and life. Baur, as Dr. Schaff afterwards wrote, "filled him with admiration for his rare genius and scholarship. He handled the problems of higher criticism with the grip of a giant." One of the documents here on exhibition bearing on Dr. Schaff's career, is the copy he took of one of Baur's courses of lectures eighty years ago.

Ewald he was accustomed to refer to as having fairly trembled when he spoke of the majesty of Jehovah and the greatness of the Prophets. His wisest words he pronounced to be the words he spoke to Dean Stanley, then a student. Holding up the Greek New Testament, Ewald exclaimed, "In this little book is contained all the wisdom of the world."

Other professors, however, Beck and Schmid and Dörner, less original but thorough and evangelical, exercised the predominant influence upon his opinions during the Tübingen period.

At Halle, he came into closest contact with Julius Müller

and Professor Tholuck, both combining pietism with profound scholarship. In both these respects they made a lasting impression upon him. He lived in Tholuck's family. These eminent teachers were his life-long friends and joined in recommending him for the professorship in Mercersburg.

In Berlin, where he began his studies in 1840, he was in the midst of the most brilliant university circle in Europe. Hegel was there: Schelling was there. With both Dr. Schaff had personal relations as well as relations in the class room. He heard Schelling on his death-bed give his dying testimony to Christianity. Of the members of the theological faculty, Neander was the most widely known. Dr. Schaff acted as his amanuensis and came to regard him as a man of singular purity of character. Fifty years later the Berlin Theological Faculty in reviewing Dr. Schaff's career pronounced the judgment that Dr. Schaff had produced the most notable monument of historical scholarship in the school of Neander.

Devoted to his theological professors as he was, Dr. Schaff was also brought into personal contact with Baron von Kottwitz, von Bethmann-Hollweg and other laymen prominent in religious circles in Berlin.

Out of this period of university study and personal communion the young student came forth settled in those views which found expression in his *Journal* in words written the last day of the year 1843 on the eve of his sailing for his new home in the west. "I am not worthy of all thy goodness. May the edification of thy church be my first and last thought: may the Holy Spirit be my impelling force and thy Word the weapon of my defence! Jesus and Jesus alone be my watch-word!"

Dr. Schaff's liberty of mind at once began to show itself after his arrival in Mercersburg, the scene of his labors for twenty years. Giving himself up to the circle which had called him, he was not kept from following paths to wider horizons. He busied himself to become familiar with the different types of American Church life and thought. He visited the Puritan

seminary at Andover, Princeton, Lane Seminary as well as the Lutheran school at Gettysburg, the Methodist at Carlisle and the Episcopal school in Philadelphia. It was but a few years till he was in correspondence with Dr. Park and Dr. Woods and Dr. Barnas Sears, of New England, with Dr. Henry B. Smith and Dr. Hitchcock, of Union Seminary, with Dr. J. Addison Alexander and Dr. Charles Hodge, of Princeton, with Dr. Stowe and Dr. George E. Day, of Lane, as well as with the Lutherans, Dr. Krauth and Dr. Schmucker, and the Methodist divines, Dr. McClintock and President Emory. Dr. Park had attended his first course of lectures in Berlin. When Dr. Schaff turned him over to Professor Kahnis for instruction in German, Kahnis, in view of Dr. Park's inveterate habit of asking questions, exclaimed: "God forgive Christopher Columbus for having discovered America!"

This liberty was next shown in the attitude he took towards the German element in America. Very soon, Dr. Schaff announced it as his conclusion that it was unwise to attempt to transplant the German language and also German religious institutions without modification in this country. It was in the line of Providence for the German element, so he thought, to adapt itself to the new conditions found in this land. In spite of the condemnation which these views brought upon him, they meant for him no abatement of his love for the people among whom he had been trained and whose usages he respected. On one of his journeys in Europe he wrote in his diary: "I will find, as I go on, that for England and Scotland, I am too much of a German and for Germany I am too much of an Englishman and for all too much of an American." Fulcher of Charters, writing at the end of the First Crusade of himself and of others who were making Palestine their home, said: "We who were Westerners are now Easterners. We have forgotten our former country." The attitude which Dr. Schaff maintained during his life in America was an entirely different one. He preferred his new home, but he never outgrew his warm attachment to friends in the old world and the old world itself.

His cosmopolitanism and wide Christian sympathies showed themselves in the extraordinary range of his personal associations and friendships. And, in turn, these friendships strengthened the catholicity of his mind. He left a record of a very large number of conversations and interviews with men of all stations giving notes of a most valuable character. He met Thorwaldsen and Gregory XVI, who insisted he would become "converted." He dined with Frederick William IV of Prussia and William I, emperor of Germany. He conversed with Metternich, Bunsen, Bismarck and Gladstone, with Hegel and Schelling on the problems of the universe, with Tischendorff and Tregelles on the MSS. of the Bible. Now he was sitting in their studies with distinguished Roman Catholic historians abroad, Hefele, Funk, and Alzog; now with Abt Henni, of Madison, a fellow Swiss, at the time on his death-bed, "very feeble and very friendly"; now he was embraced by the head of the Catholic university at Washington with the words: "No, you are not a heretic but a brother beloved."

Now he was in Edinburgh following the remains of Dr. Arnot to their last resting place near Guthrie and Chalmers; now in Berlin visiting the grave of Ranke, "the noble and brave historian." Now he was talking with Pusey at Oxford, on the primitive Church, now with Ritschl and expressing grave doubt at his statement that "he was a good Lutheran"; now listening to Wellhausen in his Arabic class with a single student in attendance. Now he was talking familiarly with that saintly philanthropist and hymn writer, Dr. Muhlenberg, or the Unitarian, Dr. Ezra Abbot, and now he was listening to Mr. Moody at an early hour of the day in the New York Hippodrome on Paul, that "little tent-maker" and expressing the opinion that "it is a sin to act or speak against such a religious revival. These meetings are a wonderful phenomenon. If only Christ be preached and souls converted, we should rejoice."

Turning to Dr. Schaff's official career and looking for his

services to the cause of Christian fellowship and union, we shall find them first in the life-long position he occupied as mediator between the theological scholarship and church life of Europe and America. No one before him had occupied the same position which he occupied. And, so far as I know, no one has filled that position so fully since. As Dr. Henry M. Field put it, Dr. Schaff "was a sort of intellectual and literary free trade clearing house between America, Great Britain and Germany." This intermediary function he performed in a number of ways. He introduced American students to distinguished teachers and churchmen abroad. He presented the American Sabbath to German audiences from Berlin to Bern. He introduced the Sabbath-school into Stuttgart and other German towns, regarding it as adapted to do good service in the German churches. On a visit in 1854 he set forth American conditions before German audiences and in a work entitled *Amerika* and again, in 1865, he did the same, presenting especially the abolition of slavery to a most distinguished gathering in Berlin and audiences in other places and writing on the subject in the face of adverse criticism. He did not hesitate to present the separation of Church and State as the best remedy he knew of for some of the church ills of Germany and Switzerland and to defend the missions of the Methodists and other sectaries on German soil in the face of much opposition. "If anywhere in the wide world," he said to a Berlin audience, "a new page of universal history is to be opened it is to be unfolded in the United States." He suggested for the first edition of Herzog's Encyclopedia the insertion of an article on Jonathan Edwards, and but for that suggestion not a single American divine would have had a place in that great work. He always defended the practical element in our American churches.

On the other hand, he interpreted German theology in its best aspects to our theological circles. He knew well that the charge, popularly made, that Germany was the seed-plot of the vulgar rationalism, neolism and destructive criticism and

nothing more was not true. In his *Germany and its Universities*, he presented in their true light the German seats of learning and many of their theological celebrities. In the *Kirchenfreund* and other publications in German, he sought to bring the German and American types of religious thought into friendly communion and promote their understanding one of the other. With taste for the hymnological treasures of all lands, he secured from the pens of Dr. J. W. Alexander, Dr. Washburn, Professor Porter and others some of the best translations ever made of German and other hymns.

This form of activity took most notable concrete form in Lange's Commentary. That bulky work of 25 volumes may pass completely out of use but it will continue to be remembered as the first international literary undertaking in the department of theology on this continent. What is now usual was then a novelty. It joined in friendly fellowship the pens of a gild of scholars belonging to two continents and to many denominations.

In view of these things, it would seem that the hope of Eichhorn, Prussian Minister of Education, in dismissing Dr. Schaff from Berlin to go to Mercersburg found fulfilment, that the theological emigrant might bind in closer union Europe and America. And it would seem that Dr. Dorner, writing a farewell letter to his young friend about to sail, was a good prophet when he said: "You will interpret America to us."

In the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance meeting in 1873 in New York, Dr. Schaff's services as an advocate of Church reunion found conspicuous recognition. That was probably the most notable religious gathering of Christian scholars and workers this country up to that time had witnessed. In a letter written by Dr. Hodge on his return from the Conference to Princeton, which I saw the other day, that eminent divine pronounced it "the greatest gathering of Christian men met for counsel since Pentecost." Upon Dr. Schaff lay the burden of securing a worthy and imposing representation of the churches abroad. In spite of the intervening

of the Franco-Prussian war and other discouragements he persisted. On the same platform in New York were seated Dr. Dorner, the representative of the highest German scholarship, Dean Payne Smith, of Canterbury, Narayan Sheshadri, the converted Hindoo, and the eloquent Spanish Protestant Carrasco. Joseph Parker and Henry Ward Beecher spoke on the same theme, the one in which they were masters. There mingled together Drs. Nevin, Hodge, Wolsey, Bishop Simpson, Bishop Bedell, and scores of other men, representatives of the various churches and mission fields.

To the end of his life Dr. Schaff remained a vigorous supporter of the Alliance and its principles and attended all its conferences but one.

Within the narrower group of the Reformed churches, Dr. Schaff was an active promoter of fellowship and ecclesiastical union. He was one of the founders of the Alliance of the Reformed churches holding the Presbyterian system. He made the opening address at the first council meeting in Edinburgh, 1877, and the two speakers who followed him, Godet, of Switzerland, and Professor Krafft, of Bonn, had been his classmates. Later he had a considerable share in securing a welcome for the Cumberland Presbyterian church into the Alliance and did his part in removing the obstacles which some of the leaders of the German Reformed church found to uniting with it.

A few years before, in 1875, Dr. Schaff represented the Protestant world in the Old-Catholic Conference at Bonn, unofficially but yet no less prominently. The Protestant professors of Bonn looked on at the Conference askance. Dr. Schaff entered into its spirit sympathetically. It was the first time for 400 years and more that representatives of the Greek church had come to the West and met with Western churchmen. At the request of Dr. Döllinger, the leader, Dr. Schaff made an address, which the Old Catholics afterwards requested for publication, an address in which he made a distinction between an article of faith and a theological speculation. After

one of Döllinger's terrific attacks upon the papacy, Dr. Schaff said to the great historian that he seemed to give the devil a larger place in the origin and development of popery than did many Protestants, to which Döllinger replied: "Yes, if you mean by the devil the old Adam."

The Revision of the English Bible, begun in 1870 and concluded 1885, gave again to Dr. Schaff the opportunity to show his catholicity of spirit and to forward the cause of Church union. Called upon by the British Committee to form an American Committee of coöperation and as chairman of that American Committee, he exerted himself to the utmost to further the international character of that work. He visited England several times in the interest of the coöperation, and, at a time when that coöperation was seriously threatened by the intrusion of the University Presses, he gave his best talents to preventing that event, which he declared would be an eternal disgrace to English-speaking Christianity. It is noteworthy that, at that critical juncture, he not only addressed the Revision companies in session at London but over the breakfast table discussed with Mr. Gladstone the subject, the two being in agreement as to the best course to be pursued.

When the translation was completed, Dr. Schaff presented the Revision to the Methodist General Conference, the Presbyterian General Assemblies and other denominational bodies from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And it was his judgment that, in the end, the Revision would take the place of the Authorized Version. At the time of his death he was looking forward to the publication of the American Standard edition.

In the controversies which were carried on within the Presbyterian church during the very last years of his life, Dr. Schaff took positive ground in favor of what he regarded as Christian liberty and the revision of the standards of doctrine handed down by the Reformers. As for the revision of the Westminster Confession he felt that what could not be preached in the pulpit should not be taught in a church formulary and that the Confession of the seventeenth century should be

adapted to the theology of our age. In regard to the doctrinal discussions growing out of the Inaugural of Professor Briggs, he denied that Dr. Briggs was a heretic and expressed the opinion that there was no foundation in fact for the theory of the inerrancy of the Apostolic autographs.

It was during these discussions that he wrote the memorable words Heresy is an error, intolerance a sin, persecution a crime.

An impressive testimony to Dr. Schaff's catholicity of mind and efforts in behalf of Church union was given by the theological faculty of the University of Berlin in its address sent to him in 1892, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of his work as a theological teacher. That address compared Dr. Schaff to Martin Bucer, the Reformer, and Jerome, the learned Father of the Church. Bucer had carried the scholarship of the Continent to England and Jerome had mediated between the Greek and Latin churches, and had shown the most lively interest in the original text of the Scriptures and given the original in the Latin translation of the Vulgate. Unlike the latter, however, the address went on to say, Dr. Schaff had not carried into one country the theological controversies of another but, on the contrary, had ministered to heal divisions and promote fellowship and reconciliation.

Dr. Schaff's last breath was given to the special advocacy of the reunion of Christendom in his address read at the Chicago Exposition on that subject in 1893. He returned from Chicago to his home to pass away in a few days.

By the reunion of Christendom Dr. Schaff did not mean the corporate consolidation of all parts of the Christian Church under one form of Church government. He held, as he wrote, that "denominationalism had been a blessing, sectarianism a curse. . . . The evil is not in denominationalism but in sectarianism, which is an abuse of denominationalism and is nothing but extended selfishness."

He believed in a progressive movement of Christian thought. Faithful to the principles of the Protestant Reformation, he

refused to be held to the view that the present time is to be bound by the formularies of the Reformers. The Reformation of the sixteenth century, he said, "has been by no means the last word which God has spoken to his people. He has other and greater things in store." In these words he set forth his confident hope for the future. "I am an inveterate hoper," he used to say. He was in favor of a theology and a confession, as he put it, "which will not only bind the members of the denomination together but also be a bond of sympathy between the various folds of Christ's one flock and prepare the way for the great work of the future reunion of Christendom in the Creed of Christ." Those last words were determinative,—the Creed of Christ. To him the central fact of theology as of religion is Christ and love for Christ, the ultimate and only lasting bond between Christians.

To Dr. Schaff, Arminianism and Calvinism were both true. The historic episcopate is an historic fact dating back to Post-Apostolic times, but Christ did not prescribe a form of Church government. The non-episcopal churches will never consent, he said, to "unchurch themselves and cast reproach upon their ministry by accepting the historic episcopate unless the article be modified and the historic presbyterate be recognized which dates back to the Apostolic age and was never interrupted."

As for his own personal purposes he declared, during the Briggs controversy, that "he would not follow any one into a split of the Church." "I shall not leave the Presbyterian Church until I am expelled. Should that occur, I will go back to my old friends and join again the German Reformed Church."

In his Address on the Reunion of Christendom, read at the Parliament of Religions, Dr. Schaff first set forth in historic statement the chief divisions in the Christian world and then the methods by which an approach has been made to Christian recognition and denominational coöperation. He then closed with a eulogy upon the leading communions, each of which in succession he calls a "glorious church." Beginning with the

Greek and Latin he emphasized the distinctive work each has accomplished until he reached the Friends, "who have done noble service in promoting tolerance and liberty, in prison reform, the emancipation of slave and other forms of Christian philanthropy" and the Moravians "the pioneers of heathen missions."

Unitarianism and Universalism, though their distinctive errors are not left unmentioned, are also praised. The former delivered New England from a stiff orthodoxy and gave us characters like Channing and our poets Emerson, Lowell, Bryant and Longfellow.

As for Universalism, it reminds us that it has among its representatives the early Fathers, Origen and Gregory of Nyssa.

Then taking up "the latest organization of Christian work, the Salvation Army which does not claim to be a church," he hailed it in spite of "its strange and abnormal methods as the most effective revival agency since the days of Wesley and Whitefield—a body of good Samaritans who are an honor to the name of Christ and a benediction to a lost world."

Dr. Schaff's *Christ in Song* offered the best illustration in his works coming under the public eye of Christian fellowship and union in the agreement of Christian singers of all ages in their praise and worship of Christ—a foretaste of that time when, to use the words of his friend Dr. Muhlenberg, which Dr. Schaff himself so often quoted

... the saints of all ages in harmony meet
Their Savior and Friend transported to greet.

In the life not lived before the public, he manifested the same spirit of Christian toleration and courtesy in his conversations about men and different types of Christian worship and doctrine as he showed in his writings and in his words spoken from the platform. On the morning on which he died, on his study desk where his living hand had left them, lay a copy of the Catholic Hurter's *Life of Innocent III*, some unfinished

manuscript and a copy of Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying* opened as he had left it. Among his very last words were: "I am a poor sinner and my only hope is that Jesus Christ died for me." On a large sheet in his journal are written eight texts, which, as he wrote down, "I use most frequently in my private devotions and my sermons," and the first three of them are these:

God so loved the world. John 3:16.

Behold the Lamb of God. John 1:29.

God be merciful to me a sinner. Luke 18:13.

The same grace which he asked for himself he believed would be given to all who trusted in the cross for salvation and this grace is the unifying bond of Christian fellowship and the essential element in the Reunion of Christendom.¹

PITTSBURGH, PA.

¹ It may be of interest to know that, in the last year of his life, it was in Dr. Schaff's mind to issue a new edition of *The Principle of Protestantism*, the inaugural address he had delivered forty-eight years before,—at once as a reaffirmation of his love for the German Reformed Church, which had called him as professor to Mercersburg, and as a new setting-forth of his conception of the historic meaning of the Protestant Reformation.

II.

THE SOCIAL MISSION OF THE CHURCH OF TODAY.¹

C. W. TRUXAL.

SOCIETY.

The social body, somewhat different from most other bodies, is composed of individual entities which are constantly in mutual relationship with one another. The life and preservation of society demand that the members of a community discharge the mutual obligations resting upon them. Men who are engaged in the study of sociological sciences tell us that the function of society is the development of conscious life and the creation of personality; that it is conscious association with his kind that develops man's moral nature; that man receives numerous endowments from society; and that a constant action and reaction is taking place between the individual and the social organism of which he is a member.

"Already you include the multitude; then let the multitude include yourself; and the results were new themselves before; the multitude turns you."

By this description of society it is not meant that the individual is swallowed up by society and that he does not possess the power of choice; but it does mean that the function of society is important and that its relation to the individual is indissoluble and vital.

CONDITION.

The social condition of the present day has become thoroughly commercialized. Everything is valued in dollars and cents.

¹ This article, in substance, is a reply to "Secularizing the Church" (REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, April, 1916, pp. 227-234). Both articles were prepared by representative laymen of the Reformed Church, at the special request of the Managing Editor.

Money values are placed above life values. There exists a frenzy for material gain such as the world never before saw. For the purpose of acquiring wealth men will engage in enterprises that render no service whatever to human society, and often in such as are a positive injury to it. Men in official positions will betray their trust for the sake of material profits. Politicians will exhort the men of the country to vote for "the full dinner pail." The material is valued above everything else. Commercial considerations have largely destroyed the freedom of the press. There is a running to and fro and a striving all over our country to-day to make money out of the present world conditions. It is said that the wealth of the United States has increased 25 per cent. during the past six months. And the worst feature about it is that this increase has gone into the hands of less than one per cent. of the population. There is a strong suspicion in the minds of the people, not without some foundation in fact, that our courts of justice are influenced to a considerable extent by the deep-rooted commercial idea. Our schools even have become deleteriously affected by the same perverted conception. Other hurtful conditions prevail. Divorces are increasing at an alarming rate. Family ties are no longer held sacred. The laboring men claim that the church is opposed to their interests and many of them as a consequence will have nothing to do with the church. Classes of men are suspicious of each other; and a hatred exists between them. But little if any sense of social justice seems to exist. Nearly all of the departments of public affairs are honeycombed with corruption. Because of all of these various conditions in human society, such as never existed before, a large amount of deep-seated dissatisfaction pervades the people in general. The signs of the times indicate unmistakably that a social crisis is staring us in the face. Present conditions cannot continue without producing dire results. Unless the course of things be circumvented they will in due time produce a terrible upheaval in our social system.

Serious as present conditions are they no doubt are the

natural results of facts and forces that have been governing the thoughts and actions of men. When we take into consideration our inherited disposition to selfishness, our system of one-sided education, the discoveries of science, the development of our natural resources, the tenacity with which the church holds on to outworn conceptions of life and duty thereby losing her grip upon the minds and hearts of men—taking all of these and similar things into consideration we need not be surprised that the people have become blinded as to their social duties—that the social sense has become deadened.

THE CHURCH.

What now has the Church to say to this state of affairs? What are the functions which religion has to perform under these circumstances?

Religion embraces all the fundamental truths that involve God's sovereignty over us, as well as our entire dependence upon Him. It is the bond that unites man with his creator. It embodies the recognition of a divine law, the moral freedom and responsibility of man, the duty of rendering homage to God and justice and charity to fellow man.

Plato says: "He who destroys religion overthrows the foundation of society." Rousseau says: "There never was a state founded that did not have religion for its basis." Hume: "Rest assured that if you find a people without religion they will not differ much from the brute beast." "The Christian religion is the fostering mother of charity and charity is the guardian of civility." The downfall of ancient Rome has been attributed to the doctrine of Epicureanism which broke down the barriers of religion.

Whatever else the Christian church may be she is an institution for the promulgation of truth and righteousness and for the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth. She represents the highest form of religion known to civilized man. She occupies the unique position in society for the development of a permanent civilization and furnishes the only solid

basis for human society. Separate from religion there are no principles sufficiently binding to exact of us the obedience we owe to the social organism.

In view of the present state of society and of the functions which religion is to perform it seems to me to be clear that no greater responsibility was ever laid upon the church than that which rests upon her now. We are undoubtedly in the midst of an epoch in the world's life. And the nature of the new period about to be born will depend upon the attitude and actions of the church—and alone upon the church. Unless the church awakens up and takes notice of the crisis at hand and asserts her power in it untold suffering is bound to come upon the people and a great calamity overtake them. Society will break down, carrying the church with it. Will the church have the wisdom to see her duty and the courage to perform it? It seems to me that the experience of the past ought to be a warning to the church of to-day. To her shame it must be said that in past epoch-making periods the church failed to note and meet the challenge and the work of re-formation had to be undertaken by persons from without. It was not the Jewish Sanhedrim that accepted the message of Jesus and applied it to the world but the poor fishermen of out-of-the-way Galilee. It was not the pope and bishops of the church that worked out a Reformation of the church in the sixteenth century, but a parish priest of Switzerland and a previously unknown monk of Germany inaugurated the movement which produced an epoch in the history of the church and the world. And it looks now as though the organized church were not awake to her opportunity and duty in the present social crisis, and that such laymen as William Jennings Bryan and Theodore Roosevelt were compelled to take the lead in pointing out existing evils and demanding remedies for them. These two men by their positive and impassioned utterances have in my opinion accomplished more for the social betterment of men, women, and children the past decade or two than was accomplished in that line by all the pulpits of all the churches in the land. These

lay preachers have alone done much to awaken a social conscience.

There is present in the people a receptivity for the truth when it is presented to them in conformity to their powers of comprehension. Men everywhere are ready to respond to the truth. Therein lies the hope of progress in the advancement and elevation of mankind. What the people need is teachers; and if the organized church fails to perform this function individuals will rise up to discharge this duty to their fellowmen.

In past ages many wrongs and evils could have been remedied and removed and much suffering prevented if the church had adapted herself to the needs of the growing social body. It may be that revolutionary epochs must take place in society, but is society not very much like an individual? Changes take place in the life of the individual which may be revolutionary. The age of puberty, the entrance upon his calling for life, the contract of a marriage alliance, these and perhaps other stages in his life constitute epochs; but they may pass without violent revolutions. By proper training and proper obedience on the part of the persons to the demands of each occasion the changes may take place in a perfectly normal way without any violence to the life of the person. If the requirements of society as it makes the transition from one condition to another were properly met the changes would also take place normally and there would be no violent revolutions. If the church will be a true seer, recognize impending changes and come forward with her message to meet the demands, one period will pass into another without any violent break in the process.

The church no doubt is willing to do her duty as she sees it. But usually the church has an imperfect conception of religion, fails to recognize the fact that the social organism is a *living* reality that needs different nourishment under different conditions, and clings to traditions and customs of the past to such an extent that she is apt to be blind to the sociological changes that are taking place from time to time. If the church will enlarge her horizon so that present conditions will clearly ap-

pear in her vision then things will be reasonably safe; but it is imperative that she do this, or abide by evil consequences. Once the church has acquired social morality and social righteousness and will realize the fruitlessness of the effort to establish the kingdom of heaven upon earth as long as a sense of social morality is wanting in the minds and hearts of the people, then will she concern herself about the individual and collective activities of life as she never did before, and any custom or conception of life and duty that will operate against the social welfare of the people will be cast on the rubbish heap. She will become interested especially in the things that are fundamental. She will insist upon it that our educational scheme shall include more than simply the development of the intellectual faculties; that the ethical side of human nature receive a due share of attention; and that ethics shall become a part of the curriculum of our public schools. With the social vision of Jesus before her the church will manifest an active interest in the family which is the root of society, and will emphasize in her public and private teaching the sacredness of the marriage vows, and will endeavor to create a consciousness in the people in general that divorce proceedings are a crime against society as well as an offence against God. The people must be made to feel that the family, the school and the church are the three great factors that determine to a large extent what the nature of human society is to be—the church exercising the controlling authority.

The present conditions demand that the church shall exercise her teaching function. This is not something new. The ancient Jews laid great stress upon the instruction of the young. The prophets were the great teachers of the people. Jesus *taught*: teaching the disciples and the people who came to Him constituted a large portion of his mission. The apostles and others since their day devoted their energies to teaching. But there is a special demand for the exercise of this function of the church at the present time. The emotional movement which swept over the church a hundred years ago

caused the teaching function to be held in abeyance to a large extent, and it is possible that much of the moral blindness of to-day has resulted from that movement. At any rate present conditions demand that positive instruction be given by the church on the subject of life in all its relations and of the manifold duties arising out of it. There are several avenues open to the church which she is challenged to enter and faithfully employ—the pulpit, the catechetical class and the Sunday school. But what is the church to teach through these instrumentalities? The Bible has been deified by many people, and given a position in the religious scheme which it was not originally intended to occupy; and hence different conceptions are entertained as to what the Bible really is and how it is to be employed for the instruction of the people so that they may acquire a proper conception of life and its duties. Shall the scriptures be memorized; shall the age of Methuselah be fixed in the mind; shall we learn to describe the slaying of the prophets of Baal by Elijah because they failed to cause the rain to fall; shall the people be taught that their infirmities and shortcomings are the result of the mistake made long ago by a man through the bad advice of his wife! No, these things may be necessary to biblical knowledge, but they do not minister unto life, they do not inspire us to live our life in this world. “In him was life and the life was the light of men.” Life and light is what men need. The church must preach and teach Christ—not about him—but his Spirit, his conceptions, his principles. When the pulpit is thoroughly pervaded by the spirit of Christ in its teaching then moral and spiritual ideals will be created in the hearers. If the preacher has the proper vision then it will also gradually dawn upon those who hear.

The catechetical class furnishes the minister a splendid opportunity for teaching the young the true conception of life in its individual and social nature and for developing their moral and religious faculties. Social regeneration will depend largely upon the training of the young. In the formative

period of life the most lasting impressions can be made. But the church owes it to its pastors to furnish them with a manual of instruction adapted to present conditions and requirements. To place in the hands of Christian teachers a book of instruction formulated three hundred and fifty years ago when church and state and knowledge of all kinds, from center to circumference, were in a condition entirely different from the present is about the most absurd thing I can imagine. The church will not have done her duty in the present day until she has placed in the hands of the catechumens a book setting forth the Gospel in its application to life and duty.

The Sunday school is an arm of the church for religious instruction. However it cannot take the place of the family or the pulpit. It is largely hampered in its work by the lack of a teaching force with proper visions. Yet by a little supervision of the pastor direction may be given to its teaching that will make good and lasting impressions upon the young that will bear fruit in time to come. If the ministry can awaken in the laity some compunctions of conscience and a moral uneasiness in regard to existing relations in society much will be gained thereby; for that will cause them to think on the subject and put them on a fair way of obtaining social visions; something sadly needed at this time.

The very nature of the church demands that for her own sake she should become interested in the social crisis that seems to be at hand. If the disintegration of society continues the church will be carried along with it into a state of chaos. But "if the church can rally sufficient moral force that injustice will be overcome so that red blood will course in a sounder social organism it will rise to higher liberty and life." In order to do so she must make due account of the prevalent conceptions of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

If the church is to bring about a social regeneration she must be able to overcome the obstacles in the way of such a moral process. Opposition must be met. The first hindrance

she will find within her own fold. In every organized body of men are found some well-meaning conservative persons who have a firm faith in statics but none whatever in dynamics. They are very much alarmed at the mention of any serious change from existing conditions. They do not realize the danger of stagnation, nor the invigorating power of new forms of thought. They serve the good purpose of ballast. They do not prevent but often seriously retard progress. They usually constitute a stubborn enemy to be overcome.

Another opposing class within the church is composed of persons who have a very selfish conception of themselves and of religion. They imagine that the chief aim of the individual is to prevent himself from going to hell. The social idea is entirely foreign to their nature. They are not bad persons, nor are they solely themselves to be blamed for their selfish notions. But they are not an enemy of much resisting force.

The most formidable opposition to social reformation comes from a class of men and women, some in the church and some without, who revel in the abundance of things that satisfy the cravings of the animal elements in their nature. Their self interests blind them to anything like social morality. They have no conception of the social body nor of the idea of stewardship. Anything that the law permits them to do is right in their eyes. Persons not as comfortably situated as they are not to be pitied but censured for their misfortune. There is no room in their soul for the thought of social justice. These are the persons who become alarmed by what they designate as a "secularizing the church." The distinction between the sacred and secular looms large in their eyes. But to others everything belongs to the Lord and ought to be brought into conformity to his will. The tendency of the modern movement is not to secularize the church but to sanctify not only the believer personally but also his possessions and his attitude and his acts in all of the relations which he sustains to his fellow men. What gives this class their opposing strength is the high positions they occupy in our social system which enables

them to exert considerable influence upon their fellow men. Their weakness consists in their comparatively small number, and on that account if for no other reason they will in the end be compelled to yield.

Another hindrance in the way of the church in her efforts to accomplish her social ends is found in some ministers of the Gospel who have become keenly impressed that many things in present affairs are not right and ought to be remedied. They fail to make a proper diagnosis of the case. They see the outward symptoms but do not apprehend the fundamental cause. They devour some socialistic literature and then imagine that society can be corrected from without. They fly off at a tangent and do more harm than good.

These and all other hindrances in the way of the church in bringing her sanctifying influence to bear upon all the social relations of men can be overcome. The province of the church however is not to put in operation outward programs, but to work as leaven in the minds and hearts of men. She is to point out and expose unrighteousness wherever it may exist and hold up before men the Christian ideals. And the truth as she presents it must work dynamically from within society itself. Christianity in the past has demonstrated its capacity to quicken the latent powers of humanity, and gain a fresh hold on the conscience of men; and she can do so again. It has been said that "unless new storms pass over our religion and cleanse it, it will be stifled by its own foliage." Anyone who has engaged in congregational work can recognize the truth of this statement.

Society, the welfare of the church and the kingdom of God unite in proclaiming that the social mission of the church to-day is to awaken a higher sense of justice and righteousness among men. And if the church will heed and respond to the voice calling to her in loud and unmistakable tones she will gather up new life into herself, the masses will recognize her as an institution that exists for the welfare of the people in this

24 *The Social Mission of the Church of Today.*

world as well as for their eternal happiness, it will be seen that she means what she says when she prays "Thy kingdom come," the friendship of the poor and needy will be regained, larger numbers of all classes will flock to her sanctuaries and the way will be prepared for the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth.

MEYERSDALE, PA.

III.

ZWINGLI, REFORMER AND MODERN.

HENRY H. RANCK.

Next to the coming into the world of Jesus Christ and the founding of the Christian Church, the event of greatest significance and blessing for mankind in all history was the Reformation of the Church in the sixteenth century. We are now celebrating the 400th anniversary of the beginning of this movement and a restudy of the facts, principles and outstanding leaders of that epoch should be in order.

The Reformation was a far-reaching movement and touched all the complex life of western Europe. It was religious in its deepest phases, yet it was also intellectual, social, political, and scientific. It came in the fulness of time. There were great preparations in the century and more preceding, which made it possible. The revival of learning quickened the souls of men as they saw again the beauties of the Classics of Greece and Rome. The Turk's taking of Constantinople in 1453 scattered the scholars of the eastern metropolis over western Europe and gave further impulse to the Renaissance. The crowning work of this intellectual awakening was Erasmus and his Greek New Testament which opened to students the life-giving teachings of Christ and Paul. The invention of the printing press about the middle of the fifteenth century made possible the wide dissemination of the fresh truths of scripture and the teachings of the Reformers. America was discovered when Luther and Zwingli were little boys, and when they were beginning their great work, hints of the new view of the universe were already coming from Copernicus. Wonderful things were happening and there was the zest of expectancy in the minds of the people. Exclaimed Ulrich von

Hutten, a knight and humanist of the period, "O Century, the studies flourish, the spirits are awake, it is a luxury to live."

The old Church was reeking with paganism, iniquity and wrong teaching. The clergy were corrupt. Penances and pilgrimages took the place of love and good works, and the simplicity and virtue of Christ were obscured by an elaborate saint-worship which was a veritable idolatry. The seekers after God in those days were like Sir Balin in Tennyson's *Idyls of the King*, when he visited the chapel full of images—"he scarce could spy Christ for saints." The wickedness in ecclesiastical high places was very evident to pure-minded men, and devout leaders in the old Roman Church tried to correct abuses. Reformatory councils were held at Constance and Pisa but the fate of John Huss and Savonarola showed that effective Reformation inside the Church was impossible. The time was ripe and circumstances were favorable for a successful revolt against the tyranny of the old Church when Zwingli and Luther, providential men, came upon the scene. Had they lived 100 years earlier they would not have been successful, and would surely have suffered martyrdom. Had Wicliffe and Huss lived a century or more later perhaps theirs would have been the great names to be associated with the Reformation, which we cannot but feel was bound to come.

The tidal wave of the Reformation broke at two points simultaneously, in Germany under Luther, and in German Switzerland under Zwingli and quickly spread not only through these nations but into the adjoining countries, showing that it was not only a local but a continental movement. These great men were working independently, attacking the evils, setting forth the pure gospel with wonderful power several years before either knew anything of the other and his work. Luther's startling promulgation of the 95 theses in October, 1517, made him quickly known far and wide. Zwingli in 1516 was already preaching the Reformation principles at Einsiedeln, Switzerland. His real work as a reformer was done at Zurich, however, to which he came in

1519. Luther was certainly very little influenced in his teaching by Zwingli, nor was the Swiss much more affected by the teachings of the great German.

The objective principle of the Reformation was that the Bible, as the word of God, is the supreme authority in theology and conduct, and not the Church; the subjective principle—that faith, as a hearty trust in God, wherein the believer gives himself completely to his Savior, is what justifies him in the sight of heaven, and not the formal mechanical doing of certain works as prescribed by the Church; the social principle was the priesthood of believers, that every child of God can have direct access to Christ without the mediation of a churchly hierarchy; the Christological principle made Christ fill for the believer the whole sphere of God with an authority and dignity which must not be curtailed by any worship of saints; the ecclesiastical principle made the Church a company of loving believers informed by the spirit of Jesus, a body in which He was the soul, and not an organization solely dependent on human leaders with the genius of Cæsar rather than Christ. All these principles were held by all the reformers with a unanimity that was simply remarkable. Of course there were differences in detail and variations in emphasis. With Luther justification by faith was the doctrine of supreme importance, while with Zwingli the Bible, especially the New Testament, as revealing the will of God, which the believer was humbly to follow and obey, seemed to be the principle of chief stress.

The Swiss Reformation was much more radical and thoroughgoing, further removed from the Roman Church practices than the German. Larger room was given to the lay element in ecclesiastical affairs, and the church organization was much more democratic, owing to the spirit of liberty already largely obtaining in Swiss civic affairs. At the Marburg conference fifteen articles of belief were drafted, on fourteen of which Luther and Zwingli concurred. On part of the fifteenth, touching the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, they could not agree, Luther holding to a view much closer to that

of the Roman Church. This was the beginning of the schism in Protestantism into the two great branches known by the historic names, Lutheran and Reformed.

Zwingli and Calvin were the founders of the Reformed branch of Protestantism, and with Luther are recognized as the great leaders of the Reformation. The significance and uniqueness of Zwingli and his teaching are often obscured by the greatness of the other two. Luther was certainly the greatest of them all. In him preëminently was the movement embodied. Martin Luther was the religious Roosevelt of the Reformation with a passionate vision of the truth, keen sympathy for and understanding of the common folk, a boundless energy and capacity for work, and a marvelous power to stir and lead the people. Zwingli too was a popular leader but the arena of his activity was much smaller, the German cantons of Eastern Switzerland. Zwingli's life was cut short by his death on the battle field in 1531 after less than fifteen years activity as an original Reformer, yet with remarkable clearness, consistency and completeness had he wrought out his system. Luther labored on fifteen years longer.

John Calvin was the great theologian, commentator, organizer and disciplinarian. He began his activities as a Reformer a few years after the death of Zwingli, whose principles and work he gathered up and continued and whom he consequently largely overshadowed. Both he and Luther were permitted to labor about thirty years in the great cause, twice as long as Zwingli.

One of the dangers of revolution is that men will go to extremes, become fanatical, and invite reaction. The Anabaptists and Socinians were the radicals of the period who were on the verge of undoing the good work and gave the great Reformers much trouble. We cannot but admire the wisdom and self-control of the leaders in not going too far and yet they were much more liberal and held to principles in freer, more vital fashion than their successors in the generations immediately following. In the controversy with the Romanists,

who claimed that the authority of the Church was supreme in all things, it became necessary for the Reformers to assert a visible, external authority. They placed the Bible above the Church, and set the infallible Book against the infallible pope. A century after Luther and Zwingli the scriptures and the creeds derived therefrom were taken in a hard literal fashion, giving us a Protestant scholasticism from which the Church has not yet fully recovered. To those who study the scriptures from the viewpoint of modern literary criticism it is quite refreshing to note the freedom with which the Reformers approached the Bible. Any teaching even in the New Testament touching doctrine or practice which they felt was contrary to the spirit of Christ they were not constrained to accept. This was especially true of Luther and Zwingli. The former called James "an epistle of straw" and said of his favorite apostle's rabbinical logic in the allegory of Sarah and Hagar, "My dear brother Paul, this argument won't stick." The latter ignored the apocalypse altogether and did not think it an inspired book. Yet withal, they handled the scriptures with the utmost reverence because they contained the word of life.

Huldreich Zwingli was the sanest and most clear headed of all the Reformers. He was the man of sober practical common sense. He had little of the mystic vein in him as Luther had. However, there was not a taint of fanaticism upon him. He gave reason its proper place. Dr. Schaff calls him a "fore-runner of modern liberal theology." If the Reformers were to come back and live with us in this twentieth century, Zwingli would be the one most at home. He was a religious progressive and it is to those particulars wherein he was ahead of even the Protestantism of his time that I wish specially to call attention.

We can understand a man only in the light of his training and the atmosphere of his rearing. When we see how Zwingli loved the classics and was a disciple of Erasmus we can more readily understand his liberal spirit. If he was a practical leader and stressed conduct, which Mathew Arnold says is

three fourths of life, we will be sure that he was influenced by the noble ethics of the old stoics.

When we note that Switzerland was a confederacy of thirteen free cantons at the time of the Reformation and that many of these cantons had been liberated from foreign tyranny for several generations, we see how natural it was for the new Protestant Church to be so democratic. Zwingli was parish priest in Glarus from 1506 to 1516. It was his first charge. Though a young man of twenty-two when he came there he became one of the most prominent men of Switzerland by his interest in public affairs before he left. He accompanied the men of his parish, serving as mercenary soldiers, on several Italian campaigns. His patriotic soul revolted against this foreign military service, and his early prominence was through antagonism thereto. Thus he came to identify the good citizen and the Christian. The Christian spirit must touch all phases of the life of the people. Calvin further carried out this idea with great rigor in Geneva. With complete separation of Church and state men to-day are coming more and more to the view that all life must be sacred and controlled by the spirit of Jesus.

"Zwingli was the first among the Reformers who organized a regular synodical Church government," says Dr. Schaff. It was at Zurich, 1528, when the Reformation was practically complete, that the Synod was convened, each congregation sending its minister and two lay delegates.

After Zwingli had been stirring the hearts of the Zurichers with the new truths which he brought to them in his systematic exposition and preaching from the New Testament, three formal disputations or public debates were held, issuing in the abolition of the Roman worship. The significant feature of these disputations was this. They were held in the vernacular and before laymen as well as clergymen. While the Reformation in Germany was decided by the princes, the Swiss Reformation was decided by the will of the people.

Zwingli was an ardent patriot and in close touch with the

rank and file of men. His tragic end on the field of battle was in keeping with his national loyalty. Zurich, Basel and Berne had in the main accepted the Reformation. If they would maintain this precious freedom they must defend themselves. They must fight. There seemed no other way. Zwingli was a statesman, and with his usual foresight and prudence was convinced that war with the Catholic cantons was inevitable, and he urged prompt preparation for it. He wrote to his peace-loving friends in Berne: "Let us be firm, and fear not to take up arms. This peace which some desire so much is not peace but war; while the war for which we are so insistent is not war but peace. We thirst for no man's blood, but we will cut the nerves of the oligarchy. If we shun it the truth of the gospel and its ministers will never be secure among us. We have in mind nothing cruel, but what we do is friendly and paternal. We desire to save some who are perishing through ignorance. We are laboring to preserve liberty." Had his counsel been followed the issue would in all likelihood have been different. War came. It was disastrous to the unprepared Reformers and prevented further spread of the movement in certain parts of Switzerland. Zwingli as pastor and councilor of his people went with them to battle, and in the second war of Kappel was killed, at the age of forty-seven.

In keeping with Zwingli's democratic spirit, he did not make changes in religious practices until the people were convinced of what was right according to the standards of scripture. He taught with great boldness but left it to the civic authorities to decide when the changes should be made. He made none until definitely authorized. He attacked the system of fasting and tithing, sacerdotal celibacy, pilgrimages and purgatory, the invocation of saints, the primacy of the Pope and the mass. In the spring of 1524 the old Roman order of worship was abolished and the churches of Zurich were cleansed of pictures, relics, crucifixes, altars, candles, frescoes, and all ornaments. The walls were whitewashed. The Latin singing of the choir was abolished and the organs removed. It was a

thoroughgoing purging of the temple but orderly withal, owing to the poise and prudence of Zwingli. He had a program which he hoped to accomplish by degrees. The mass was finally abolished and the Reformed method of celebrating the communion introduced, Easter, 1525. Through all this procedure he recognized the principle of gradual development, which is the surest method of progress, but which received scant regard in his day.

The practical sanity of Zwingli is further seen in his relation to out-door relief of the poor in Zurich. The people generally were imbued with the principle of the old Church, which urged liberal giving to those asking alms without further inquiry into their worthiness, teaching that special merit attached to such generosity. More harm than good often came of this practice. Zwingli saw this and was independent enough to criticize it. He proposed, says Dr. S. M. Jackson, "that the public alms should hereafter be given only to those who had been investigated, and could show actual need"—which reads like a line out of a modern treatise on scientific charity.

The Reformers were all Augustinian in their theology. Preëminent in their thought was the sovereignty of God. As predestinarians they claimed that the human will was not free and were led to this emphasis out of opposition to the Roman Church, which practically denied the majestic sovereignty of God. The Reformers differed in their approach to the doctrine, and their teachings were colored accordingly. Luther stressed the sovereignty of God because of his belief in the utter depravity and incapacity of man. Zwingli stressed it because of his view of God who is a gracious overruling providence, "the sole essence of all things" (*solum rarum omnium Esse*). He carefully guarded himself against pantheism. Nature is not identified with God, the ultimate reality, though it comes from Him as its living energy. As to the character of God, He is absolute goodness, an active everflowing beneficence, full of tenderness and mercy. "That good so abounds that it satisfies all the desires of all to satiety; for it is infinite

and loves to be drawn upon." In this noble, ethical conception of God we see the basic reason for his liberal views which make him stand out from the other great leaders of his time.

Predestinarian that he was, he did not shrink from making God responsible for the entrance of sin into the world. He claimed that sin was necessary to holiness and was for the ultimate good of the creature. Virtue was produced by struggle against evil and was made the more conspicuous thereby. He acknowledged the difficulty of the problem and did not claim to have solved it satisfactorily. In one particular, however, in this connection his teaching is notable. He makes a clear distinction between the corruption of our nature and what is properly sin. He says: "Sin, according to the gospel teaching, is of a twofold nature. First, it is that disease which we contract by the law of heredity and which Paul recognized when he said (Romans 7:20) 'It is no more I that do it but sin that dwelleth in me.' Secondly, sin is that which is contrary to the law; so that through the law comes the knowledge of sin. Any act, therefore, contrary to the law is sin." Zwingli denied that there was a native or imputed guiltiness in man. The fall and its terrible consequences he held to, but original sin was an inherited disease (*morbis*), a *defectus naturalis*, a calamity indeed, but involving no personal guilt and was not worthy of punishment until it showed itself in actual transgression. Original sin, this base bent to evil within us, is the fruitful germ of actual sin, "as the inborn rapacity of the wolf will in due time prompt him to tear the sheep." This refreshing teaching of Zwingli showed his originality, his departure from his master Augustine. His teaching here was a preparation for Arminian and Socinian opinions and the modern view. The creed makers of the Reformation period were not prepared to follow him. The Heidelberg Catechism, the loved and revered symbol of the Churches which look to Zwingli as one of their founders, says in the tenth answer that God "is terribly displeased with our inborn as well as actual sins and will punish *them* in just

judgment in time and eternity." Though Zwingli compared original sin to the misfortune of one born in slavery he nevertheless believed all men would be lost because of it unless saved by Jesus Christ. Him God provided for a sacrifice to redeem fallen man and therein is further seen the boundless goodness of the great God.

Zwingli's conception of the all-permeating activity of the loving God was a liberalizing factor in his view of the world and its worth. Wherever a good and holy thing is found it is to be regarded as an emanation from the divine source. In this connection emerged his most startling teaching which greatly shocked his contemporaries. He believed in the salvation of the virtuous heathen, who were seekers after truth and lovers of righteousness. They were unconscious Christians or "pre-Christian Christians." This breadth of view came in part from his enthusiasm for the ancient classics and admiration for their authors. He expected to meet in heaven not only the Old Testament saints from Adam to John the Baptist but also such men as Socrates, Plato, Pindar, Aristides, Numa, Cato, Scipio, and Seneca. Zwingli claimed, in the words of Dr. Schaff, "There is no good and holy man, no faithful soul, from the beginning to the end of the world, that shall not see God in His glory."

Akin to this teaching was his doctrine of the salvation of all infants dying in infancy, whether baptized or not. The Roman Church taught that there was no salvation outside of the Church, hence the need of baptism. Luther too taught baptismal regeneration. The great symbol of the Calvinistic system says "Elect infants dying in infancy are saved," from which there is an unmistakable inference as to the destiny of non-elect infants. There are many pious parents still who would be in great anxiety should their children die unbaptized. More and more the modern view touching both infants and heathen is that of Zwingli. He is often misrepresented as teaching salvation apart from Christ. This he did not hold, nor did he explain when or how Christ is revealed, but he

claimed that we have no right to set limits to the boundless wisdom and love of God nor may we hold any theory which morally dishonors Him. With Zwingli religion was a spiritual thing which was greatly aided by the Church with its rites and sacraments but was not absolutely dependent on them. The Roman Church tyrannized in its claim that beyond it was no salvation. If men were only in the Church and obeyed its laws and followed its requirements in however perfunctory a fashion, even with lives immoral and scandalous, they were safe and all was well. There are many in our Protestant Churches who hold essentially the same view. Zwingli taught that there was an "invisible Church" of true believers who really touched Christ by a living faith and received from Him the life more abundant. Following him all the Reformers held that there was this "invisible Church" inside the visible Church but with Zwingli, as in the case of the pious heathen, it extended beyond the bounds of the visible Church.

Faith was a vital thing with Zwingli. It was not simply intellectual assent to a body of doctrine, or belief in the Church. It was living touch with the gracious God as revealed in Christ. It must produce a virtuous character in likeness to Christ or it is not a living faith at all. Zwingli's God was a moral being and the fruit of the Christian religion must be righteousness. Throughout his teachings can be seen the constant effort to rescue the true character of faith. This faith is an experience, an internal operation of the soul. It is trust in Christ, with purposes and affections directed on Him, and is therefore not produced by external means but by the Holy Spirit. Dr. Frank H. Foster says: "This effort of Zwingli in behalf of a consistent definition of faith may well be counted as among his most important contributions to the cause of evangelical truth. That faith is a spiritual process, produced by spiritual means, is a far-reaching principle of the utmost importance. Much as Protestant theology has insisted upon faith, it has long been obscure in defining it. Could Zwingli's

fundamental ideas have been fully received, that faith is an act of self-committal, that it is a spiritual process of the soul and that it is the eternal life which Christ promised, already in exercise and possession, then long and gloomy chapters in the history of Reformed Theology, in which the story of spiritual paralysis in consequence of ignorance of the way of salvation and positive misrepresentation of the gift of divine forgiveness, might have been spared the world . . . Zwingli's clearness and breadth would have spared generations of Calvinists, before Edwards and after him, from the necessity of consequent darkness and pain."

Justification by faith alone with Luther was the article of the standing or falling Church. His undue stress of this great truth is seen in his ignoring the epistle of James with its gospel of good works, the indispensable evidence of true faith. Zwingli did not fall into this error. Dr. Foster has spoken of the deviation of Reformed theologians from the true path. Let Dr. Dorner in a letter to Bishop Martensen of Denmark—both Lutherans—speak for the other great wing of Protestantism: "I am more and more convinced that the deepest defect of Lutheran Churchism heretofore has been a lack of the full appreciation of the ethical element of Christianity. This becomes manifest so often in the manner of the Lutheran champions. There is lacking the tenderness of conscience and thorough moral culture which deals conscientiously with the opponent. Justification is made to cover, in advance, all sins, even the future ones; and this is only another form of indulgence. . . . The doctrine of justification is often misused for lulling the conscience to sleep, instead of quickening it." Undoubtedly there is an increasing realization in our day that true faith is a simple whole hearted trust in Jesus, and loyalty to his principles, wherein we are going back not only to Zwingli, but to Christ Himself.

In accordance with Zwingli's spiritual view of religion he looked on the sacraments as important aids but not indispensable channels of salvation. Baptism into the name of Father,

Son, and Spirit was consecration to Father, Son, and Spirit. It was a commitment of the one baptized to the Lord Jesus. Salvation was not dependent thereon. Zwingli did not believe in baptismal regeneration.

Zwingli is perhaps most widely known in connection with his teaching on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and this because of his controversy with Luther in the spectacular episode at Marburg, in October, 1529. In opposition to Rome, the Reformers all bitterly antagonized the doctrine of the Mass, wherein it was claimed that the bread and wine were transformed into the very body and blood of Christ. They regarded it "an accursed idolatry."

The three great Reformers however differed among themselves in defining the nature and significance of this sacrament, Luther, nearest to the Roman view, held that in, with, and under the bread and wine was the body of Christ which was partaken by the mouth. He held to the corporeal presence of Christ therein, and his theory is called consubstantiation, over against the Roman, known as transubstantiation. Those who partook were supposed to be believers and yet it was possible in this view to partake of Christ without faith, though in that case of course to condemnation. Luther insisted on the literal interpretation of the words of institution "This is my body"—Zwingli took his stand on Jesus' words—"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life." One sees conspicuously here again his effort to show the spirituality of our religion. The communion was a great aid to faith. It was a devout commemoration of Christ's death and work. However, only by faith, not by the mouth can Christ be received, whether it be in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist or under any other circumstances. Calvin's theory took in the points of view of both Luther and Zwingli. He taught a spiritual real presence. Christ was present in the sacrament not corporeally but dynamically, and therefore really, as the sun warming us is present in the genial rays.

Calvin stressed faith and the activity of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament. His theory came to be the one generally accepted in the theologies and symbols of the Reformed Churches. Zwingli's view has been looked on as superficial, though in certain passages it comes very close to that of Calvin. Dr. Thomas M. Lindsay says: "Zwingli held that there was a real presence of Christ in the Holy Supper; but a spiritual presence brought by the faith of the believing communicant and not by the elements of bread and wine which were only the signs *representing* a body which was corporally absent. The defect of this theory is that it does not make the presence of Christ in the sacrament in any way depend on the ordinance; there is no sacramental presence other than what there is in any act of faith." Zwingli certainly did not believe that the presence of Christ could be made real by any Churchly ordinance. It was a remnant of the Roman Church theory of *opus operatum* to hold that by the consecration of the elements and the sacramental transaction Christ would be in the Holy Supper in a fashion not possible elsewhere. Whether this be a "defect" or no will depend on the theories of the Church held, in which there are decided differences among Protestant denominations and among members and leaders of the same denomination to-day. There are not a few otherwise strong Calvinists, who nevertheless hold the Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper. It is not my purpose here to be a protagonist for any particular theory of the sacrament, only to show Zwingli's views. Surely in this and in the other particulars of his teaching and leadership he was a forerunner of modern ideas which are coming to prevail to a great extent.

Religious toleration is a late product of Christian history. It remained for the United States to make a grand and beautiful demonstration of it. No part of our constitution receives more general and hearty approval than the provision guaranteeing religious liberty. The time was not yet ripe for it in the Reformation days and all the Protestant Churches then and for generations thereafter were in one way or another

guilty of intolerance. Phillips Brooks in his *Lectures on Toleration*, however, has this to say: "Of all the Reformers in this respect (tolerance), Zwingli, who so often in the days of darkness is the man of light, is the noblest and clearest. At the conference in Marburg, he contrasts most favorably with Luther in his willingness to be reconciled for the good of the common cause, and he was one of the very few who in those days believed that the good and earnest heathen could be saved."

We find numerous hints of Zwingli's generous, tolerant spirit. In dealing with the various congregations he had no desire to suppress their individuality. In a synod at Basel the last year of his life when the question was raised as to whether the congregations represented should have the same litany, his judgment was that, though such uniformity was desirable, it was by no means necessary and ought not to be made obligatory. After the first war of Kappel a treaty of peace was effected between the Catholic and Reformed cantons of Switzerland in which Zwingli figured prominently. It guaranteed to both parties religious freedom in the form of mutual toleration. Dr. Schaff says this "treaty recognizes for the first time in Europe the principle of parity or legal equality of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Church"—a principle twenty-six years afterward recognized in the peace of Augsburg, 1555, and finally settled after the thirty years war in the peace of Westphalia, 1648. The peace of Kappel did not hold for long, but it was the index of an honest conciliatory purpose.

Zwingli was sometimes severe, intolerant, and even cruel, and it was difficult to be otherwise in those days when precious liberty had to be defended if it was to be maintained at all. Zwingli acquiesced in the punishment of several Anabaptists, who threatened to overthrow his work in Zurich, and by a cruel irony were drowned in the Limmat. Few men can pass through bitter controversy and maintain a fine self-control and proper courtesy. Zwingli did "contrast favorably" with the

great and turbulent Luther in the Marburg Colloquy, yet he could and did say ugly things. Desiring to extend the hand of Christian brotherhood to Luther after the conference, he said: "Let us confess our union in all things in which we agree; and, for the rest, let us remember that we are brethren. There will never be peace in the Churches if we cannot bear differences on secondary points." He fell short of his ideal as who does not. His generous and kindly spirit stand revealed, however, in the beautiful and touching prayer with which he entered the conference: "Fill us, O Lord and Father of us all, we beseech Thee, with thy gentle spirit, and dispel on both sides all the clouds of misunderstanding and passion. Make an end of the strife of blind fury. Arise, Christ, thou Sun of righteousness and shine upon us. Alas! While we contend, we only too often forget to strive after holiness which Thou requirest from us all. Guard us against abusing our powers, and enable us to employ them with all earnestness for the promotion of holiness."

Zwingli was far from perfect as a man, teacher, and leader. All of us have the defects of our qualities. He shared in some of the limitations of his time with its prejudices and superstitions—defects which after all were of practical advantage in maintaining touch with the common folk. He is especially criticized for his political activity and his opposition to the prevailing policy of pacifism among the Protestants the last few years of his life. He was, however, a keen-eyed man of affairs and none knew the animus of the Roman Church better than he. Many agree with the judgment of Dr. Samuel Simson: "Zwingli, with the clear vision of a prophet, foresaw the untold calamities which must eventually befall the Protestants if they refused longer on account of petty doctrinal differences to recognize their essential brotherhood, and unite as one man for the defense of their faith. The sequel proves that in the main Zwingli was right."

His last words as he lay wounded on the field of battle were: "They may kill the body but they cannot kill the soul." His

body was quartered for treason and burnt for heresy. His ashes, mingled with those of swine, were scattered to the winds, but through these centuries his soul has been marching on. Many of his ideas, too advanced for his own time, are now largely held. The keen, calm, comprehensive soul of the liberty-loving Swiss Reformer of four hundred years ago was a kindred spirit with the progressive, open-minded searcher after truth to-day. Dr. Samuel Macauley Jackson, in concluding his studies of Zwingli sixteen years ago, claimed that he was not receiving from Christendom the consideration and honor which were his due, but said that "there are signs of revival of interest in the able and lovable stalwart Swiss, sincere Christian, and uncompromising foe of sham religion." This movement of belated appreciation ought to come to high tide in this quarto-centennial of the Protestant Reformation.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

IV.

PHILLIPS BROOKS.

FREDERICK F. SHANNON.

In searching out the foundations of the greatness of Phillips Brooks, we must reckon with his ancestry. For he nobly fulfilled the saying of Holmes, that a man, in order to be great, must select his parents two and a half centuries before his birth. On the Phillips side, we can trace Brooks' ancestry back for nine generations. And they are a great people. We find in them a fine blending of thrift, uprightness, intellectualism, and spirituality. The eighth generation flowered out in the beauty of a character rarely equaled in the person of Mary Ann Phillips, the mother of Phillips Brooks. In spiritual passion and sacrificial devotion, she ranks with the great mothers of all time. In spiritual-mindedness, she recalls the mother of Saint Augustine, of John Wesley, of Horace Bushnell. "She had a deep interior life of the soul," says Professor Allen, "whose phases were more real and vital than the phenomena of the passing world. . . . From his childhood to his death, the inexpressible tenderness of Phillips Brooks for his mother was one of the deepest characteristics of his being, as her influence was one of the higher sources of his power."

For nine generations, also, we can trace the ancestral stream of the Brooks family. On this side of the house there is, indeed, a different atmosphere. Negatively, there is an absence of predominant devotion to intellectual and spiritual ends. Positively, there is a prevailing tendency to practical affairs. They are men of business, men of patriotism, men of unflinching integrity. When, therefore, William Gray Brooks and Mary Ann Phillips were married in North Andover in 1833, there was the union of two strains of as pure, unadulterated

Puritanism as perhaps ever commingled. And so it was into an unpretentious house, but a true Christian home, on High Street, Boston, that Phillips Brooks was born on December 13, 1835. We propose, in our study, to gather his life about the three periods measuring his wonderful career: First, the Period of Self-Discovery. Second, the Period of Unfoldment. Third, the Period of Ripening.

I. THE PERIOD OF SELF-DISCOVERY.

No matter what is revealed later on, one of the profoundly interesting periods of a great man's life is that of self-discovery—those strange, mystic, awkward, aching years in which a boy of genius is trying to find himself. Like all healthy children at the age of three, we find baby Brooks wanting something. His father is away from home, and his mother writes: "Phillips says, 'Tell Papa I have learned to use a fork,' and wants you to bring him a red-handled knife and fork." Red, by the way, continued to be his favorite color through life. At four, he comes home from a private school crying. He explains the cause of his tears by saying the teacher had told him to write a composition on "The Elephant." At seven, he writes a letter to his mother and signs it, "Your affectionate Friend, Phillips Brooks." About this time, there is a pencil story worth recalling. One night the boys were in the back parlor, with their slates and pencils, preparing lessons for the morrow. Phillips had a new pencil, which he continued to thrust further and further into his mouth. Finally, it went down his throat. He at once asked his mother what would be the result if any one swallowed a pencil. She told him that he would probably die. Phillips said nothing more. But nothing more was ever heard of the pencil, either. At eleven, he entered the Boston Latin School. He may not have been, at the outset, the best of students. For in his twelfth year, he wrote on a scrap of paper, which is still preserved as a precious document, the following resolution: "I, Phillips Brooks, do hereby promise, and pledge my-

self to study, to the best of my ability." It was in this Latin School that he received fine training in the classics. It was here, also, that he began to manifest that literary style, which is peculiarly his own, and which gives such distinctive power to his sermons and addresses.

He was in his sixteenth year when he entered Harvard College. His Harvard career shows that he had ability for genuine scholarship. Yet it also shows that he did not aspire to maintain high rank in his class. He stood fifth as a freshman, sixteenth as a sophomore, thirteenth as a junior, and sixty-sixth as a senior. He had no inclination for mathematics, exhibited some taste for natural history, succeeded in chemistry, indifferently endured the natural sciences. He was, however, a true lover of history, especially in its biographical form. But he cared nothing for dry-as-dust historic facts as presented in the class-room. He despised elocution, because he thought that it begot self-consciousness. He maintained a high grade in intellectual philosophy, rhetoric and logic. But there was one department in which he was the acknowledged leader, and that was the languages. He toyed with French, respected German, stood very high in Latin, and uniformly excelled in Greek. Now, his biographer sums up this phase of his career by saying that Brooks could have been what is technically known as a scholar. But "what stood in his way was his love of literature as the revelation of man, the yearning to enter into the deeper experiences of life, to know the world he lived in." And yet, I think, it is not too much to say, in the light of his after development, that the very thing which stood in his way as an all-round scholar, was also the very thing which enabled Phillips Brooks to discover the person for whom he was searching—himself. For, like many another youth, deaf and dumb to mathematics and the natural sciences, the voice of the world's supreme literature found a rich response in the depths of his being. He at once obeyed that voice, rose up and followed on to those shining heights, where he began to forever associate with the master spirits of the ages.

But just what of a distinctly religious character was going on in the boy's soul at this time, it is impossible to say. On both sides of the sea, the prevailing mood was one of religious doubt. We are told that in the nineteenth century religious faith and hope reached their lowest point. Matthew Arnold describes it as "the wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born." As Brooks failed to join the Church, though the proper age was "from sixteen upwards," and though he knew that the consuming desire of his mother was to have him confirmed, it is possible that he was undergoing some inward religious struggle. After all, I confess that this is nothing more than inference. For, in studying Phillips Brooks, we must remember that from childhood to the day of his death, he scarcely ever shared with a human being, not even the mother whom he adored, those profound secrets of his inner life, which were known only to God and to his own soul. While simplicity was the key-word of his youth and manhood, his "was a character singularly complex despite its simplicity, a career wherein there were epochs and distinct phases of development."

As we know, his first attempt to accomplish something in practical life met with conspicuous failure. I refer to his brief career as a teacher in the Boston Latin School. I have a first and a secondary reason for explaining that failure. But I mention, in passing, only the secondary, which is this: The crowd of boys over which he was placed as teacher deserved the argument of a pugilist, rather than the classical refinement of the future preacher, fresh from college. Bare recital of a few tricks that class played upon the inexperienced young teacher will, I believe, enforce my conclusion. One boy threw a handful of shot into Brooks' face. Looking around, the frustrated pedagogue saw an innocent-looking youth, holding up the very hand which had thrown the shot. But the young imp seemed to have been suddenly regenerated. For he was in the deferential attitude of one who wanted to make earnest inquiry concerning school work. Another lad plugged up the

thermometer with snow. After the mercury had fallen below the freezing point, the rascals complained of the cold until the room, already hot, was made unbearable by piling more fuel upon the fire. "Then," we are told, "the windows were thrown open and the opposite process begun, till the thermometer, reinforced with snow, called for a reversal of tactics." After prayers one morning, he looked up and saw his boys bedecked with eyeglasses, made of strips of tin, filched from a neighboring tinshop. Then he discovered that he was locked in the room with that wicked class. He was also compelled to let a boy down from the window to the ground, at the same time beseeching him to remove the obstructions from the plugged-up key-hole. Frankly, is it any wonder that Phillips Brooks failed as a teacher in the Boston Latin School?

But because this very failure as a teacher marks a crisis in his life, it must not be lightly considered. For the awful desperation, the unutterable despair, the untold agony he experienced during the six months following his resignation as a teacher—these are things which make one uncover in the presence of a soul endeavoring to understand its majesty and its mystery. He was at this time a chivalrous youth of twenty, possessed of a sensitiveness of nature but seldom paralleled, and handicapped by a reserve which was profound indeed. With radiant face and high ideals he had walked joyously up to the Palace of Life, rung the door-bell and waited for an answer. For a brief moment, a mystic door stood slightly ajar. Then an unseen hand rudely slammed it in his face, leaving him without in the deepening gloom. But it was while standing there in the vast gloom of his aching disappointment, that he visioned that Light which lighteth every man, coming into the world, heard a Voice sweet with the melody of an infinite music, beheld a Face he was to love and be loved by forever. It was now that he sought that true confessor of souls, President Walker, of Harvard College. The details of that sacred interview were never given to the world. But we do know this: Doctor Walker advised Phillips Brooks to study

for the ministry. Coming out from that interview, he was seen by a young tutor named Charles W. Eliot, who was on his way to Doctor Walker's home. Eliot says the face of Brooks was of "a deathly whiteness, the evidence of some great crisis." In 1881, our world-famous preacher called upon this same tutor, now president emeritus of Harvard University, to decline the offer of a professorship. Again his face was strangely white, and President Eliot remembered the vision of 1856.

On the eve of his departure for the seminary at Alexandria, Virginia, Phillips Brooks wrote these words in his journal: "As we pass from some experience to some experiment, from a tried to an untried scene of life, it is as when we turn to a new page in a book we have never read before, but whose author we know and love and trust to give us on every page words of counsel and purity and strengthening virtue." Now, I cannot stay to analyze those three years in the seminary. Suffice it to say that many of his friends thought the coming great preacher was throwing his life away, and frankly told him so. Fortunately, as I have already said, Phillips Brooks was mothered by a true mother. She not only labored six sons into life—she also prayed six sons into the Kingdom of God. She, too, believed that her marvelous boy was throwing his life away. But he was throwing it away, she thought, only to find it again, multiplied an hundredfold. She wrote: "Keep close to your Saviour, dear Philly, and remember the sacred vows that are upon you, and you will surely prosper." Love-lyrics like this flowed from her mother-heart into the life of her noble son, until she ceased to walk with God here to abide at home with Him forever.

That the change from Boston life to the seminary was a marked one, may be gathered from the young theologian's letters, many of which abound in humor. On the day of his arrival at the seminary, he wrote that his lordly apartment was a garret in an old building called the Wildreness. Its furniture consisted of a bedstead and a washstand. He says: "I

looked in, threw down my carpet bag, and ran." Speaking of bedsteads, we recall that they were a bone of contention throughout his life, no matter in what part of the world he traveled. And it is only fair to say that the fault was not always with the bedstead. For Phillips Brooks, during almost two thirds of his life, was six feet and four inches long. He says he escaped from bed once at an untimely hour because, to use his own words: "I could not stretch out straight or make the narrow bed clothes come over me." He wrote from Athens: "The classic fleas fed on us through the dewy night." We learn, also, that the seminary furniture and bill of fare were in perfect harmony. For he writes to his father: "Did you ever eat tomato pies? Well, they alternate with boiled rice, which is troubled with water on the brain, as our daily dessert." Already allied to the spirit of progress, which was manifest throughout his career, he adds: "Last night a new dish made its appearance, which looked like a flapjack that had tried to be a loaf of brown bread and failed in the attempt."

Now, it was in the seminary that Brooks exhibited a capacity for scholarship, which had been somewhat lacking in college. From the graves of Greek and Latin, no longer dead languages to him, there flamed forth the resurrection power of new worlds of thought and experience. Entirely distinct from his class work, the scope, the variety, the strength of his reading at this time is nothing short of marvelous. Why, he reminds one of Macauley, eating and digesting books as a ravenously hungry boy eats buckwheat cakes, whose blessed adhesion is assured by an abundant supply of delicious country butter, whose haunting flavor is far removed from the realm of probabilities by genuine soakings of pure maple syrup. And his notebooks show that he was not engaged in mere discursive reading, however wide. Rather, that the tremendous impact of the world's thought had shaken the depths of his nature, that his very soul was being shaped into a kind of sensitized plate, which would in coming years photograph with exactness, fineness, and majesty, the life of God in man's soul, and

the life of man in history. It was at Alexandria, I think, that Phillips Brooks discovered himself. Through self-discovery he also discovered the master principle of his life-work, viz.: The principle which proclaims the eternal value of the human soul, revealed by the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, and redeemed by the passion of God on Calvary. Having found his principle, he moved steadily forward in his own magnificent interpretation of it. He held that the human soul, in order to be loved, must be known. And it was for qualifying himself to interpret this truth to men, that he wandered up and down the highways of literature. "But wherever he went, from great writers to those less known, heathen and Christian, ancient and modern, he never failed to extract judgments of value, unsuspected revelations of the beauty, the dignity, the greatness, the worth, of the human soul."

And, mark you, when Phillips Brooks, at the age of twenty-one, had discovered himself, he had done it forever. Of course he expanded, he broadened, he deepened, he heightened, he ripened. But it was only more of the same kind, rather than more of a different kind, of the stuff out of which great life and character are wrought. I think his words concerning John Henry Newman give keen insight into his own life. He said: "Newman was a remarkable man, by no means of the first-class, for he never got a final principle, nor showed a truly brave mind; but there was great beauty in his character, and his intellect was very subtle." Now, his journals reveal that, fortunately for the world and for himself, Brooks got hold of final principles in his boyhood. For example: He believed in his boyhood that the Incarnation meant that God and man had met together in the person of Christ, the fullness of God and the complete perfection of humanity; and he believed it always. Again: He believed in his boyhood that Christ's death on the cross was in some mysterious, organic way connected with the forgiveness of guilty human sin; and he changed worlds with the same conviction. In a word, Brooks discovered in his youth the unity of life in Jesus Christ. And with increasing

splendor, he preached "that all life is one great harmonic chorus, appealing to the individual soul to join in the universal strain." Blessed is the man who discovers a final principle at life's threshold rather than at life's end!

II. THE PERIOD OF UNFOLDMENT.

Now, if I have dwelt overmuch on the formative years of Brooks, it is that we may approach the period of his unfoldment with a just appreciation of the backgrounds in which his life and ministry were cast. I believe no man ever came to his work with more thorough equipment. The subject of his first sermon was: "Christ as the Centralizing Power in the Spiritual Life." The text is II. Cor. xi. 3: "The simplicity that is in Christ." He afterwards said the sermon was a two-fold failure—first, it was lacking in simplicity, and, second, it had nothing in it of Christ. Yet I think a study of the sermon will bear out Professor Allen's statement that it has "the evidence of a marvelous maturity." He was less than twenty-three when he wrote it, and still in his seminary course. But he strikes with masterful and prophetic power the truth that Christ is the center toward which all roads lead—"all truth, all reality, in whatever sphere manifested, in literature, art, or science, all the positive acquisitions of man in the long range of history, all great events and movements, have their affiliation with Christ."

This, then, was the style of preaching to which forty or fifty people were listening in the Sharon Mission, three miles from Alexandria, in 1858-59. One Sunday two strange faces were seen among the Virginia mountaineers. They were men who had come to hear and then to call Phillips Brooks to the Church of the Advent in Philadelphia. In July, 1859, he preached his first sermons there, having agreed to supply the pulpit for three months. Many years afterwards, he playfully recalled an incident of those first weeks of ministerial experience. Walking home with a vestryman one Sunday evening, Brooks suggested that perhaps he had better not remain even for the

three months. The vestryman gave him the chills by answering: "Well, as long as you have begun, you had better stay out the time for which you were hired."

However, he had been in the Church of the Advent only seven months, when he received a call from St. John's Church, Cincinnati, at that time the largest and wealthiest Episcopal Church west of the Alleghany Mountains. At the beginning of his second year in the ministry, his fame had crossed the continent. He received urgent calls, extending from Newport to San Francisco. The little church on the corner of York Avenue and Buttonwood Street had become a veritable magnet, drawing people from all parts of the city. On Sunday evenings, the streets in the locality of the church were filled with carriages. And lest the admiration of the Quaker City should spoil the darling of her heart, once again we hear his mother's voice saying to the brilliant young preacher: "I had rather hear you praised for holiness than for talent, though of course that is unspeakably precious when used in God's service. But, my dear Philly, let no human praise make you proud, but be humble as the Master you serve, and never forget what an honor it is to be the servant of Christ." Among the greatest ordination sermons ever preached in the history of the Christian Church, are the sermons preached by the mother of Phillips Brooks to Phillips Brooks himself!

What, then, was the secret of this young physical, mental, and spiritual giant, whose ministry was now beginning to throb through the nation's life? As this question was asked for over thirty years throughout the English-speaking world, I shall answer it in the words of the truest interpreter of Phillips Brooks: "The world was right in fastening upon his true and genuine manhood as his predominant characteristic." Back of all he said, back of all the wonderful manner in which he said it, stood his total manhood, all of his faculties unified in Christ, who "had taken him, as the sovereign harmony takes the wandering tone." He believed that a man whose mind and heart are not working in unison gives no true,

abiding light. Such a man, he said, is like a match which will not strike without the box; and you haven't got the box. The world was saying then, as it has ever said, as it is saying today: "Remove first the obstacles which stand in the way of human progress, and then men will be able to live." Young Phillips Brooks laid his axe at the root of this fallacious tree. He struck it hard blows, and his weapon had a keen edge. And while the decayed chips were falling all around him, he cried: "The world, humanity, has already been redeemed by Christ. The opportunities of the divine sonship are open to every man. Live! Live greatly now." He gave us our greatest definition of preaching in three words. What is Christian preaching? He answered: "*Truth through personality.*" He defined liberty as "the genuine ability of a living creature to manifest its whole nature, and to be itself most unrestrainedly." And truly, these definitions put on flesh and blood in the unfolding manhood of this pulpit prodigy. "Now," he cried, "here is a truly new conception of life: Man is something to be lighted, and to be obedient to the flame that illuminates him." Do we wonder that the students of the University of Pennsylvania, coming out of the Church of the Holy Trinity on Sunday afternoons, imagined they beheld a rosy splendor on the face of the late afternoon sky? One of them says: "The very heavens were on fire, not because the sun was setting across the Schuylkill, but because the preacher had projected a light into the open sky of the heavens—the light of the mystic, the light of the prophet, the light which never was on sea or land."

Here he was, then, at twenty-six, the most discussed preacher in Philadelphia. Moreover, his influence had broken the bounds of his parish and denomination, overflowing the city. He was not only the foremost preacher, but one of the Quaker City's foremost citizens as well. Is there not something strangely beautiful in beholding this brave youth, this clerical Sir Galahad, associating with men from all walks of life, old enough to be his father? And yet, there seemed nothing incongruous in such fellowship. While he held a high position

and represented strong social influence, chiefly did these older men gather around him because his personality was simply invaluable. His "fascinating eloquence gave a new and potent charm to the cause so dear to them." And what was that cause? Why, the deathless cause of human freedom! Already the black clouds of civil war were hovering over the land. Next to Abraham Lincoln, no soul felt a deeper dread than did the soul of Phillips Brooks, lest their unsheathed lightnings should blight and blast our national tree. And now it was that our White Knight's soul seemed to expand into a vast cathedral, along whose invisible aisles he heard the tramp of a million feet, he heard the rain of bitter tears, he heard the sacrificial flow of the nation's most precious blood. But from whose heavenly dome he also heard the voice of the Lord God of the nations thundering: "Let my people go! Let my people go!" And when Phillips Brooks had heard that voice, this young idealist, this velvet-souled poet, this snow-hearted Saint John became an ancient Moses coming down from a modern Sinai, with the tables of God's eternal law in his hands, with the music of God's eternal truth in his heart, with the splendor of God's eternal light in his face, and the people were afraid to come nigh him! Though he wist not, like Israel's leader, that the skin of his face shone, none the less did he flame and flash like an incarnate Vesuvius!

Now, Brooks was at this time exemplifying what had become the synthetic principle of his life-method. What was that principle? "The nature and source of power, how it was to be fed, how ideas and truths and beliefs were to be transmuted into power." As of Jonathan Edwards, it is also true of Brooks: "There was in him something of the seer or prophet who beholds by direct vision what others know only by report." He was richly endowed with the historical imagination, which enabled him to enter into the life of the race. And this, in turn, made it possible for the racial life to flow back into his own individual being. He admired physical power wherever manifested—in worlds, in mountains, in seas, in men. It was

one of his habits to stand as close as possible to the majestic rush of a giant locomotive, thundering onward with the great express train, as if it in some strange way reflected the power within him. When asked in later life what he would rather have been if he had not become a preacher, he answered: "I would like to have been the captain of a great ocean steamer, or, better than that, a young girl in her teens, awakening to the consciousness of her beauty, and without effort subjecting to her sway those who came into her presence."

But into the higher realms of power it was his ruling passion to go. He was always reading while traveling. Finishing a book, he threw it out the car-window. "You might trace him in his journeyings," says his biographer, "by the trail of books." He loved to meet and greet the spirit of the strong man wherever he trod the pathways of history. He claimed him for his elder brother, though he were Homer, Socrates, Dante, Shakespeare, Wesley, Edwards, Robertson, Bushnell, or Beecher. He possessed an ingrained admiration for power. Combined with his spiritual genius, this inborn admiration enabled him more fully to incarnate the power of the Highest, which overshadowed and made him a moving tabernacle of power. Henry M. Stanley once heard Brooks preach. He confessed that it was not only the most rousing sermon he ever heard, but that it actually made him feel excited. He affirmed that, as a young man, such a sermon would have stirred him to action. This, then, was the man who stood in the Church of the Holy Trinity and spoke these words, which still burn like a subtle fire: "The devil of slavery had kissed the strong shoulders of the Republic, and the serpents sprung from his defiling lips were preying upon her life. It was agony to tear them off, but it was death to let them remain. Despite our anguish, we had taken courage to rid us of the abomination." And then, while Lincoln's dead body lay in the City of Brotherly Love, the scorching, raging fire of the prophet's eloquence was subdued into the sobbing tones of the broken heart and the saint's vision. He then said of the martyred President what

men are saying still of the mighty preacher: "In him was vindicated the greatness of real goodness and the goodness of real greatness." Thus, in those unfolding years, Shelley's words best describe him:

"All familiar things he touched,
All common words he spoke, became
Like forms and sounds of a diviner world."

III. THE PERIOD OF RIPENING.

Coming now to the period of his ripening, I am aware that you have already asked the question: "Why does he not say something about Phillips Brooks and Boston? For is not Phillips Brooks Boston, and is not Boston Phillips Brooks?" Now, your question is entirely valid. But it is well to remember that behind life's foregrounds lie life's backgrounds. What I mean is this: For Saint Augustine, the Milan garden lay behind the diocese of Hippo. For Chrysostom, the desert and the cave lay behind Constantinople. For Edwards, Northampton lay behind Stockbridge and its deathless books. For Robertson, Winchester, Cheltenham, Heidelberg, and Oxford lay behind Brighton. For Maurice, Bubbenthal and King's College lay behind Cambridge. For Liddon, Wantage lay behind Oxford and Saint Paul's. For Beecher, Indianapolis lay behind Brooklyn. For Bushnell, New Haven lay behind Hartford. For Simpson, Greencastle lay behind the Episcopacy. For Matheson, Innellen lay behind Edinburgh. And so, for Phillips Brooks, Cambridge, Alexandria, and Philadelphia lay behind Boston. Of his Boston ministry, I wish to speak of Brooks the preacher and the man.

He was thirty-four years old when he went, as rector, to Trinity Church. I have not time to consider the struggle in his own soul, the anxiety of his father and the attendant sickness of his mother, because he refused the first call to come back to his boyhood home. And, finally, on his accepting the second invitation, how his own Church and the City of Philadelphia were fairly stunned, as if they had been the victims

of some dire catastrophe, so deeply and intricately had he woven himself into the organic life of the community during his ten years there. It is not too much to say, however, that Boston—the “Hub,” the immovable—was moved at his coming, and began to revolve around his ministry as have few cities in the history of Christian preaching. On Sunday, October 31, 1869, he preached his first sermons as rector of Trinity Church. His morning text was: “I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.” His afternoon text was: “My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work.” I recall the texts, because they are an index to the new power, they pitch the key of the new music, they suggest the new and deeper spiritual splendor now enfolding him, they strike a new note of passionate urgency, which increased in volume, depth and grandeur for the next twenty-two years.

Before he had become well settled, somebody—and I am am half inclined to believe it was Almighty God—cleaned up his Boston parish by sweeping the old Church away with a broom of fire, that he might have a building in some sense adequate to his own greatness and majesty. I never enter the new Trinity Church, I scarcely ever think of it except as Phillips Brooks dressed up in the splendid clothing of that stately stone pile. And so, when this preacher-prophet, with his boundless hopefulness, with his exuberant vitality, with his mental and spiritual flame, swept like a holy, glowing radiance over Boston, what happened? Why, all churches and creeds rose up at once to claim him. Unitarians said: “He belongs to us.” Baptists said: “He belongs to us.” Methodists said: “He belongs to us.” Presbyterians said: “He belongs to us.” Congregationalists said: “He belongs to us.” Protestant Episcopalians answered, with pardonable pride: “You are all mistaken, he belongs to us.” All of which, I think, is but another way of saying that Phillips Brooks belonged to no one denomination. For the Lord of All anointed him and presented him as a gift to the Universal Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ!

Let us now examine some individual witnesses to the power of his preaching. One says: "As he is lifted by his theme into a rarefied atmosphere, and with a marvelous faith catches a glimpse of still higher summits to be reached, like a mountain climber, scaling from crag to crag, you are rapidly borne along with him, till the worries of earth look very trifling from the crest where he pauses." Another: "Out of twenty or more of his sermons which we have heard, there has not been one which would have been unsuitable for a revival meeting. Whatever the subject, the central thought is always the cross of Christ—the goodness of the Gospel to a sinful soul." After hearing him preach in Grace Church, New York, in 1870, a writer in the *New York Evening Post* said: "He preaches the humanity of Channing with the creed of Jeremy Taylor, and strikes at the shirks and shams of our day with the dashing pluck and full blood of Martin Luther." Principal Tulloch, after hearing him in Boston in 1874, wrote to his wife: "I have just heard the most remarkable sermon I ever heard in my life (I use the word in no American sense) from Mr. Phillips Brooks, an Episcopal clergyman here: equal to the best of Frederick Robertson's sermons, with a vigor and force of thought which he has not always. I never heard preaching like it, and you know how slow I am to praise preachers. So much thought and so much life combined; such a reach of mind, and such a depth and insight of soul. I was electrified. I could have got up and shouted." Dean Stanley once invited Brooks to preach in Westminster Abbey on a Fourth of July, which fell on a Sunday. Many felt that Brooks had been asked to perform a difficult task. Stanley himself was by no means assured of the outcome, with such a red-hot American in such a pulpit on such a day. Happily, Lay Frances Baillie, a sister-in-law of Dean Stanley, has recalled an interesting incident connected with the service. Immediately after its close, she slipped into the deanery by the private door, reaching the drawing-room before any of the guests who were to come in from the abbey. She

found Dean Stanley, with tears running down his face, a most extraordinary thing for him. On her appearance, he burst out with expressions of intensest admiration, saying: "I have never been so moved by any sermon that I can remember; and, oh, the wonderful taste and feeling of that passage at the end!" When asked how Brooks compared with the great preachers of Scotland, Professor A. B. Bruce replied: "It is this way: our great preachers take into the pulpit a bucket full or half full of the Word of God, and then, by the force of personal mechanism, they attempt to convey it to the congregation. But this man is just a great water main, attached to the everlasting reservoir of God's truth and grace and love, and streams of life, by a heavenly gravitation, pour through him to refresh every weary soul." I once said to Doctor David Gregg, himself a great preacher, and former pastor of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn: "You knew Phillips Brooks: how did he impress you?" His face lit up as he made this answer: "I lived in the same block with him for several years. How did he impress me? Why, Brooks was big all over—big at the top, big at the bottom, big at the center—a towering physical, mental, and spiritual colossus." Then, pausing a moment, he added, with characteristic discrimination: "The first thing that happened to you after hearing Brooks finish a sermon was a kind of collapse, which was immediately followed by a majestic feeling of bigness in your own soul." Ah! I do not wonder, when our White Knight visited Japan, the children shouted, as he was borne along the highways: "Look! There goes the image of the great Buddha!" Thus was he greatly unique, splendid, incomparable. As a preacher, Brooks can, of course, be imitated by no man. But what is far better, he is a fountain from which every man may drink, because he gives matchless expression to the vast undertones and overtones of the human heart. For he believed and taught, with his twin brother in the spirit, Robertson, of Brighton, that—

... "All the past of time reveals
A bridal dawn of thunder peals
Wherever thought hath wedded fact."

But great as he was as a preacher, Phillips Brooks was even greater as a man. He was not an expert in aristocratic littlenesses, but he was a prince in manly nobilities. The late Doctor Weir Mitchell, not only a specialist in nervous diseases, but a specialist also in his judgment of men, says: "I have known a number of men we call great—poets, statesmen, soldiers—but Phillips Brooks was the only one I ever knew who seemed to be entirely great. I have seen him in many of the varied relations of life, and always he left with me a sense of the competent largeness of his nature." After lecturing to the students of Andover, he closed by saying: "Let us pray." One of the students told Bishop Lawrence that, praying from the same desk at which they had heard professors pray, Brooks "offered a prayer which, as compared with theirs, was so beautiful that he had to open his eyes to see how a man looked when he prayed like that." A mother in Israel, ninety-three years of age, told me that she used to go to Boston once a year just to hear Phillips Brooks pray. She said he was even a "greater pray-er than a preacher." A workingman once wrote him: "To me you reveal God as no other man does. What I mean by that is, I can't think of you for ten consecutive minutes without forgetting all about you and thinking of God instead; and when I think of God and wonder how he will seem to me, it always comes round to trying to conceive of you enlarged infinitely in every way." A woman who scrubbed the floors of Trinity Church asked him that her daughter might be married in the chapel. He said: "Why not take the Church?" "But that is not for the likes of me," sighed the poor soul. Then Brooks towered like a mountain of celestial glory as he answered: "Oh, yes, it is, for the likes of *you*, and the likes of *me*, and the likes of every one. The rich people, when they get married, like to fling their money about. But, my dear woman, that is not necessary in order to be married

at Trinity Church." And the wedding took place in Trinity Church. The great organ was played, too, as if the bride's rags had had the rustle of silk or broadcloth. And I doubt not that God's angels looked on while God's true priest made them man and wife. Two poor, ignorant Roman Catholic women lived in Salem. One was bemoaning the fact that her son had fallen into evil ways. Though neither had ever seen him, the other said to the sorrowing mother: "My friend, the thing for you to do is to take your boy to Phillips Brooks." One Sunday morning, a dying colored girl sent for him through her sister. As he was then ready to enter Trinity pulpit, he sent his assistant, who explained why the rector could not come just then. The dying girl said: "Then you go back and tell Phillips Brooks I won't die until he comes." And she didn't die, either, not until he had come and administered the Holy Communion! On a Christmas morning, Brooks watched from his window a street urchin, who was having great fun ringing door-bells, and then running away before any one could open the door. When the lad reached the rectory and rang the bell, the preacher, who had concealed himself in readiness, at once opened the door. For a moment the boy stood speechless at such an unexpected revelation of avoirdupois and kindly, beaming countenance. Finding his tongue at last, he said: "*Why, is that you, Phipps Brooks?*" He treasured this as one of the finest tributes he ever received. He was touched to tears to think that a homeless, ragged, little child should take his name upon his innocent lips as if it were a household word, as if it were as natural as to greet the morning sun and say: "You are God's dear gift to the world."

And now I must bring to a close this imperfect interpretation. So many things have been inadequately said. So many things, also, remain unsaid. Brooks' life was not an unbroken flow of joy. No truly great life is, or can be. He was oftentimes a lonely man. He never married. But he adored one woman—his mother! Sometimes he was misunderstood. Once he was publicly hissed in an Episcopal Convention. But

he always carried the heart of a child, the purity of a saint, and the greatness of a great Christian. I never saw him in the flesh. But I have often seen him in the spirit. Many years ago, while sitting as a boy under a Kentucky apple tree in midsummer, I saw the picture of his noble face for the first time. To me, he began that day to make manhood majestic. Ah! his manhood was so magnificent that it dwindled skyscrapers into atoms, and compressed worlds into the dimensions of marbles! He blinded the devil of envy by the splendor of his smile. He made love captivating. He made virtue beautiful and bewitching. He made faith natural. He made goodness contagious. He made religion vital. He made spirit, soul, and body unite in his own imperial nature, until he became a walking melody inspiring the lives of men. He made the Fatherhood of God more winsome than the bosoms of all the mothers who have labored all the children of men into life. He made the Saviourhood of Christ Jesus mean more to the soul than the sun means to the day. He made the reality of the Holy Spirit, the ever-present Comforter, Strengtheners, and Illuminator, to be more sweet and lovely than any lovely song. I know you will forgive me for saying that I shall always be glad that I first met Phillips Brooks under an apple tree. And some day, please God, I expect to meet him again under the Tree of Life. If I do, it will not be far from the throne of white and the river of crystal. Then will I thank him for showing me, in the years of earth and time, to better love and serve the Lord and Master of us all. Just six months before he died, out there on the ship plowing the great deep, he wrote his dear song called, "The Waiting City." One time I remember well the song refreshed my soul with its delicious sweetness. I was walking at the dark end of the day. I was also out in the vast open spaces of being. My feet were on the meadow and my dreams had stolen in behind the stars. I was saying over and over again those golden words of George Borrow: "The wind is on the heather, brother: life is sweet." I looked up, and the evening star

threw its silver kisses right down into my face. I looked back, and the full-orbed moon shot its old lustrous glory right across my path. I looked up, and out, and around, and yonder, underneath the evening star and the full moon, lay a many-colored sea, whose amber, violet, hyacinthine waves washed all the shores of night. I thought the musical color-sea was chanting a requiem for the dead sunset. It was then and there that Brooks' song slipped into my heart like a rhythm of unearthly peace. Then I repeated it aloud. But as its melody went drifting down the winds of sunset, it did not fail to leave a holy hush in my soul. Written on the bosom of the tumbling deep, "The Waiting City" has none of the ocean's storm. But it has much of Heaven's deep, sweet, inner calm:

"A city throned upon the height behold,
Wherein no foot of man as yet has trod;
The City of Man's Life fulfilled in God.
Bathed all in light, with open gates of gold,
Perfect the City is in tower and street;
And there a Palace for each mortal waits,
Complete and perfect, at whose outer gates
An Angel stands its occupant to greet.
Still shine, O patient City on the height,
The while our race in hut and hovel dwells.
It hears the music of thy heavenly bells
And its dull soul is haunted by thy light.
Lo, once the Son of Man hath heard thy call
And the dear Christ hath claimed thee for us all."

Within half a year after writing the song, Phillips Brooks entered "The Waiting City." I shall always be glad that he left the dear earth for the dearer Heaven just at dawn. As morning came, he went. Not many hours before his death the servants found him, his mind wandering, climbing the stairs leading from his own room to the topmost story of the rectory. Asked where he was going, he replied: "I am going home!" O, beautiful, glorious, fulfilled prophecy! For with the breaking of that very dawn he went home, and—

"Never to the mansions where the mighty rest,
Since their foundation came a nobler guest."

Yes; thanks be unto God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost—that ineffable Trinity whose unspeakable glories he preached so matchlessly—thanks be unto the Great Three in One:

“He died when dawn was sweeping o’er the land,
When morning glories lit the gleaming wall;
And one who watched him, holding his worn hand,
Whispered: ‘Alas! that he should miss it all!’

The early sun, risen from his dark night,
Flamed his great banners when he went away;
And one said: ‘Lo! at coming of the light
He hath gone forth and lost the beauteous day!’

But our White Knight, from mortal house of pain
Gladly released, went singing to God’s place,
And cried: ‘Dear Lord, after the bleak world-rain,
I cannot bear the splendor of Thy Face!’”

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

V.

THE FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH TO-DAY.

ROBERT F. REED.

The earth is the Lord's. All things are his. Yet there are not a few people who are inclined to be more or less skeptical as to when the kingdoms of this world will become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ after the cry of the New Testament seer. At any rate, men are pretty well of one mind that that blissful condition of things has not as yet been attained. No one but a person given to disputation would insist that our day is ideal.

We do not, however, want to overlook the fact that the terms church and Kingdom of God are not synonymous. Church membership and religion are not always identical. There is no need, on the one hand, of arguing the point that not all church members are Christians at heart. But we ought to say in passing that the organized church is still the best and most helpful means to be had by people who are deeply concerned about their highest welfare. On the other hand, in times past there were Christians, and, no doubt, at this time such are still to be found, outside of the church of Christ. When, however, we think of the splendid character such persons succeeded in cultivating without the aid of church relationship we can't help but wonder into what sort of spiritual giants they would have developed had they been identified directly with the church and rightly availed themselves of the help indisputably there to be obtained.

The church is viewed at times in so broad a light as to include the whole of mankind. All men are members thereof; and this not potentially either only, but actually. Regardless of what their moral and religious condition may happen to be,

and, of course, regardless too of what may be their relation to the organized institution itself, all people from the mere fact that they are human beings are members of Christ's church. To become a member of the human family is at the same time also to become a member of the church. Certainly, the advocates of this liberal view of the church would admit that there is a vast difference among men: some are near the Kingdom; others are openly hostile to it; many are indifferent; and many again sincerely try to do God's will as they see it. But all, whatever may be their relation to organized religion as such, or even their attitude to God and his Son, are really and truly members of the larger church of God.

This interpretation of the church does not appeal to us. And it is difficult to see why it should seriously be entertained by any one. What is to be gained by it? According to the generally accepted view of the church of God it is necessary for men of the world to become transformed before they may rightly be regarded as having a proper place in the church; before the church may be said to have become really helpful to them. On the other hand, according to the broader conception of the church just cited, no doubt, all men are agreed that church membership carries with it nothing of real value to any one member until he permits the eternal verities to lay hold upon him, and until in some way he comes to conform to the standard of life as set forth in the word of God. What then would be the difference after all?

Where does this conception of the church come from, we may ask? Perhaps it grows out of the idea of the universal Fatherhood of God. To be sure there are many grades of God's children: some realize their privileges; others are at the other extreme; and between these two classes there are various degrees of sonship. It may be more helpful to a man to have his attention called to the fact that he is actually a child of God than to be told that potentially only he is such a child. So also it may be the means of giving men a certain value that otherwise they would not have if they are told that they are a

part of the Christian church even though they themselves are well aware that they are far different in spirit from what church members ought to be. But, assuredly, religion is an affair of the heart, of the inner life, and certainly, not primarily, not to any great extent, a matter of labels; not a question of designating a person one thing or another. To call a person who is worldly in mind and heart a saint does not in reality make him saintlike. Calling a man a member of the church does not magically give him the character that we ordinarily ascribe to such a person. The fact is not as a rule disputed that calling a bad man good may be the means of getting him to think that he ought to be better than he is, and thus actually help him make an attempt to amend his manner of life. Yet in itself the mere name does not very perceptibly make him good. Treating a man as a good fellow does not inevitably make him a good fellow. A thing that is black remains black even though you try to persuade yourself that it is white. At any rate, whatever your position may be in the matter, others will think of what is black as black, and if you keep on insisting that it is white, you need not blame men if they are disposed to question your right to a claim of sound judgment. In this connection it is well to remember that men outside of the church do not think of themselves as having such a position in relation to it. They seem not at all to be anxious to be identified with the church. And the claim that the church thus makes for men can really have no very beneficial influence upon them. The church means too little to the class of men who are to be helped by this broad conception to beget in them an effort to wake up to a higher standard of life. What then is the use of entertaining such a view?

But whatever our position may be in the matter there is no doubt that there are large numbers of people who have not yet assimilated the gospel; whose ethical standard is not that set forth in the Bible. Vast multitudes on the one hand have not heard, or at least have not accepted the story of the cross. This phase of the work is spoken of as growth externally. The

number of unchurched at home and abroad is very large. But this fact is so well known that we need not tarry here. If, moreover, all men are members of the church, then certainly the condition of many is such that they are not aware of their opportunity, and therefore they too in any case need to be aroused. Therefore, no matter how we view the case, there is a great deal of work that still must be done.

There are two reasons for this state of affairs. In the first place, so many people care not, at least in a small measure only, for that for which the church stands. They have no taste of which they have any knowledge for things spiritual. These things, whatever they signify unto others, do not appeal to them. Then again it remains true that the members of the church, who because of their relationship to it are in a position to realize what blessings the church bestows upon men, are from all appearances not sufficiently in earnest to share them with others; to put forth any kind of an effort commensurate with the paramount importance of the whole matter to see to it that their poor unfortunate fellows come to know and accept the gracious offer of heaven. Evidently many a Christian is but lukewarm and apparently does not appreciate what Jesus Christ stands for either for himself or for others. The traveling missionary secretary seemingly has very good cause for his impatience with men in view of the indifferent treatment they give him and the work dear to his heart. And yet, after all, is he not immoderate in his demands, and does he really not look for what is impossible, if he sincerely expects much in the way of help for the heathen and unchurched from one at home who is himself not a thorough Christian, and who evidently has no more that he can call his own in relation to Christ than the name only? People who do not make good use of the place of worship immediately accessible to them are not likely to be particularly and effectually concerned about seeing to it that others may have a place in which to worship. Church members who need to be urged to read the word of God are not very apt to give more than a mere

pittance now and then in order that others may have the same word. Fathers who seem to be indifferent as to whether their own children attend to their Christian privileges, who take their growing and habit-forming sons and daughters out on a pleasure ride on Sunday morning, and thus encourage them to grow up with, to say the least, a very questionable attitude to the Lord's day and the teachings of the gospel, are not generally very much exercised as to how the young people of distant lands grow up. And, of course, as a rule, Christians of this type do very little in a material way to improve matters among that large group of people whom we deem spiritually poor.

This inactivity on the part of church members, on the other hand, goes to indicate at least that there is still room in the church for internal development as well. The better we come to know Jesus Christ, the more fully we come to appreciate his matchless character, the more clearly we are able to see into the unique claims of his kingdom, the better also are we enabled to understand his supreme value to society. His gospel alone is the key to the contentment of the present and it is the only gateway to mankind's ultimate well-being in the days to come. After two thousand years men pretty generally should have learned to know him and therefore also to recognize his inestimable value to them. Have the children of men learned to appreciate the Christ? Is there much of the Christ-like in society to-day? Do men as a general rule actually follow Christ? Are they sincerely bent upon obeying the Master? Are the principles for which Christ always stood the deep rock bottom upon which society to-day rests? I am not asking whether such is the case more so now than formerly; not whether men are coming closer to Christ in our day than a century or two ago. That would be a very different matter. Men as individuals, as members of families, as citizens of various communities, as capitalists, as laborers, or as units anywhere in our very complex society; are men deliberately trying to do Christ's will? To what extent has the heaven

leavened the whole lump? If we were to compare our day with the day before yesterday, no doubt, it would become our pleasure to report progress. But while as servants of the Lord, on the one hand, we are here not so much to glory in what our fathers achieved, so also, on the other hand, we are here not even to glory in our own progress thus far, commendable though that may have been. But we occupy the place that God has assigned unto us in order that we may attend, and that faithfully, to our own tasks that still remain; to see to it that we do our part well.

There is undoubtedly a marked tendency on the part of church members to yield to the pressure of the secular spirit upon them. For example, it is not only the unchurched, or those who are more or less distantly related to the church, who thoroughly enjoy the experience of amassing fortunes, oft-times with an utter disregard as to how the game is played. Luxuries, to an unusual degree, are indulged in by church members, while the unchurched, and often many of the church too, rush on in a mad career of sin, and but the feeblest kind of an effort—if we may speak of what men seemingly try to do as an effort at all—is made to arrest them in their downward course. The very attitude of the members of the church even toward the worship of God in his house is often not correct and praiseworthy. From a mass of evidence we must conclude that men either no longer, or not yet, feel the need of worshipping God. There are those who look upon the church as effete, played out, as out of date, an obsolete institution, whose days are happily numbered.

Thus we see that we who are deeply interested in the coming of the Kingdom still have a great deal of weakness to overcome; of wickedness to contend with and root out. Men beyond the bounds of the church, and at least some even within her borders, are not in accord with the essential facts of the Kingdom of our Lord. Such a knowledge it is proper for us to have in order that we may deal with the malady more efficaciously.

Since such is the condition of things no one would seriously question whether the church of Christ has a mission among men to-day. There are many who proclaim the fact far and wide, and who take pleasure in the self-appointed task, that the church of the past went on in her serene way with but a feeble and frequently a misguided effort to help men in a manner worth while. And in some way they have come to persuade themselves that it is their duty by agitation and appeal to strive to keep the church of the present-day from continuing in the same mistaken channel. The form of our subject would seem to indicate that the essential work of the church varies from age to age. Of course we are not unmindful of the extreme view advocated by an iconoclastic group of men that the church is a superfluous agency foisted upon society by a selfish and indolent priesthood in the long dim past and supported ever since by an unthinking and all too credulous people. This view is however so radical and moreover so wholly unworthy of serious consideration that we can well afford in this connection to dismiss it without further attention. Admitting then that the church has her place among men, what is that place? The family has its function in society. So also does the state. Yet even here there is a difference of opinion as to what functions these two very old institutions are to perform. And it is to be expected that men should differ as to just what more especially the church ought to emphasize from time to time.

→ The origin of the church should serve to throw some light upon this problem. Of whom was it originally composed? The answer is obvious. Of the followers of the risen and exalted Christ. The church at first, whatever may have been true of her since that time, was a fellowship of believers banded together in love. And the primary reason why the early followers of the Lord were united into one body was that thus they might the better be able to continue the story of Christ's coming, life, death, resurrection, ascension, and power among men, and in this way indirectly be of help to one another, and

to others outside of their small band, by inspiring them to do and to suffer if need be at the hands of men in a society not too kindly disposed to Godfearing men: to proclaim the good news of the Kingdom and at the same time also to extend its borders. Just as in all other spheres of life those of like tastes, of the same pursuit, are naturally drawn into each other's society, so, too, in the sphere of religion from the very first people drifted together into one body. And to be sure the things of the spiritual world growing out of the events of the Saviour's life concerned this band more especially. True, it was not very long until they came into contact with the material things of their every day life. But this only because the members of the church were after all still members of a larger society and therefore unavoidably had to deal with such matters as houses and lands and their proper distribution among men. And yet the early church never lost sight of its main business. The incident of the Greek widows, whatever other conclusion we may come to with reference to it, certainly does not warrant us to hold any different view than that the leading men of the church upon whom the chief work rested could not be spared for so secondary a matter as table serving, as the work of ministering to the bodily wants of an element in the church however deserving of help the cry might happen to be. That work had to be attended to by another group of men. But it is well to remember that even these men, though especially appointed for a more or less secular task, never lost sight of the chief spiritual end of the church.

Have we any reason to believe that the work of the church is different in our day? We know of no change authorized in history. We know of nothing that so much as seems to indicate that the Founder of the church contemplated a different mission for her later on in her development. Early as well as later history informs us that all attempts made by the church at various times to launch out into new waters, to enter upon courses of activity not tried before, whether on a small or on a more pretentious scale, proved decidedly futile. Did the

church not have the right to come to the conclusion from these unsuccessful ventures that she was trying to accomplish what was extraneous to her appointed task? Did these failures not teach her that she was bent upon a mission upon which her Lord had not sent her? Or, on the other hand, were her failures after all not perhaps due to the fact that she pursued wrong methods of work? We are confident that for the church essentially to modify her age long course at this time, even though with the sincere desire and purpose to effect an amelioration of mankind's condition, would be nothing else but disastrous to society at large. For the church to magnify the material at the expense of the spiritual is to mistake her own peculiar mission unto men.

Yet we meet with no small group of men, for example, who never cease talking of the social function of the church of Christ; who do this as if it were the only one for her. Lectures, addresses, sermons, and even books that no man can number, call attention to the duty of the church along this line of activity. By their very persistence and importunity the advocates of this idea succeed in disseminating among an ever increasing number of people the view, nay, the conviction, that the Christian church of our day is very indifferent, if not recreant to her main obligation in relation to the children of men. Not a few very earnest Christians feel assured that they are leading their congregations aright when they induce them little by little to transform their places of worship into distinctively social centers for their community. They seem to be convinced that it is at least as important that the doors of the church should be as wide open during the week for the people to gather in a social way as that they should be opened on the Lord's day and occasionally during the week in order that people may come together in a reverent manner to worship God in his temple. The reason that this view appeals so strongly to men is due to the fact that it contains an element of truth. The church building is but rarely used throughout the week. Yet the structure represents an expenditure of no small

amount of the people's money. Why not make use of it on week days as well as on Sundays? The answer is not only that if the church serves the one end she is supposed to serve she does far better in the way of genuine helpfulness unto men than many other agencies do upon which people spend far larger amounts of money, but also—and this is after all the chief objection to the plea for a secular church—that by turning aside from the regularly appointed work and by trying to minister unto people along a number of different avenues not open to her she ultimately will fail in her chief duty unto men. Undoubtedly man is a social being. And just as his other needs are met in one way or another, so also must his social needs be satisfied. The play instinct is universal. This has to be provided for no less after people have united with the church than before. But certainly the church must not make so much of this need on the part of her members that she will be in danger of overlooking her chief and unique function in relation to men.

There is no question again, that the relations of men in so far as they are wrong ought to be corrected; that differences between labor and capital ought to be adjusted; that the rich ought to respect the rights of the poor; that the poor in turn ought to be willing to recognize at least a few prerogatives as belonging unto the rich. No doubt also some of our laws ought to be repealed, and perhaps there is room even for at least a few new ones from time to time. Many a person ought to lead a much better, a cleaner, a more honest life than he does. No persons, however influential in society and whatever positions they may happen to occupy in the church, and moreover no matter how large their contributions in the way of congregational support may chance to be, ought to be allowed to make use of their fellows as of so many tools for selfish ends, sacrificing not only the bodily but the spiritual welfare as well of such servants. And at least a small proportion of people ought to have pressure brought upon them from without in the direction of a higher life.

And who is to do all this but the better class of people in a community, the men and women who are bent upon doing what is right? Certainly, members of the church may be counted among this class of people. It is their duty to see to it that the ills of life are removed, and to bring this about just as speedily as possible. But the question, it must be remembered, is just what is the relation of the church to all this? Is it her chief business to tackle this oftentimes disagreeable job directly? Is it the duty of the church, either as single congregations, or as groups of congregations of perhaps different denominations united into a solid phalanx, to go out into the world and try to correct any clearly outspoken evil of society? Would it be wise for the church, through the Consistory, or through any other official organization, or even through a new organization especially created for that end, to go out and fearlessly take up the task of making right anything that her hands may find to do in the way of wrong in any corner of society? And if she hesitates or refrains entirely from entering upon this work as an organized body, is it fair to accuse her of passing by on the other side, and this for no better reason than because of the fact that the work is not very congenial? Does the church, after all, not have a loftier and in the end a far more helpful mission to perform in relation to humanity? Men who claim that the church's work is upon a higher plane ought not be accused, if not of downright laziness, neither of a want of sympathy nor of callous indifference in the midst of pressing needs on the part of struggling humanity. I suppose that the church members who advocate the idea that the church and her members have a right to stand wholly aloof from these matters are very scarce. Such persons' conception of what should claim the attention and enlist the direct help and the profound sympathy of a man, a real man, would indeed be a very strange one. Matters of this kind concern men deeply. They will not suffer themselves to be ignored. They are ever present. And anything of interest to man after such a fashion the church can't afford to overlook. Along the frontier, whether

in the home land, or in the foreign field, in sorely neglected quarters of our large cities, it oftentimes becomes necessary to put forth organized efforts to the end that matters in society may be properly adjusted.

And yet in no case should the church forget her main business, which, however pressing the call of material things may be, is most assuredly not directly to disentangle earthly difficulties. Our public schools stand primarily as centers of education. Their end and purpose is the education of the youths of our country. If, however, any child should be improperly fed, or clothed, or in other respects neglected, when appearing in the school room in the morning, such neglect would be of some concern to the teacher in charge. What school authorities would not become especially interested in such a child? Yet no one, I trust, would hold that in that particular case the essential aim of the school could be relegated into the background and become a secondary matter. I don't suppose that any Sunday school would feel fully satisfied if it permitted a child really in need of food or clothing to come to its sessions Sunday after Sunday if nothing in addition to the word of God in various ways would be held out to the poor boy or girl. On the other hand who would say that the Sunday school had attended to its primary mission in relation to that particular child after having received it, satisfied its hunger, clothed its body with good warm garments, and then forthwith returned it to the home or street whence it came? Would it not become an easy matter for the child to feel that the material things that it happened to get in that school were the chief things to be had there? Again, would there not be some danger for the officers and teachers to whom was assigned this work to become so absorbed in the service thus rendered as to forget in part if not wholly the spiritual end of the school? Is it not possible for us to picture to ourselves after a vivid fashion what would have been the loss to the children of men if the leaders of the church of the first century would have abandoned the work of preaching the gospel only in part even for the seemingly very

excellent reason that the bodily need on the part of men at that time that was exceptionally great was entirely neglected; or for the reason that if an attempt was made by others at all to relieve this need the work was indeed but very poorly done? Let us suppose that Christ had given all his time, or at least more of it, to the relief of temporal needs. He did not a little work of this kind. He certainly, had he seen fit to follow this path in life, might have done very much good in his day. But the Master realized that his main work had to do primarily with the souls of men. And to that work he attended before all else. In our desire to do real efficient and permanent service in behalf of mankind we must not fail to make the distinction between what is first and what comes after that even though it follows very closely upon the heels of what is really first.

The main function of the church in the twentieth century is no different from that same function in the first century. It is the chief business of the church of Christ, now as always, to minister mainly, not to men's bodies, but to their souls; to feed first, not their hungry mouths with the daily bread of the material things of life, but to nourish their famishing souls upon the heavenly bread of eternal life; to relieve chiefly, not the temporal wants of men by means of the perishing things of the world that the church may be able to command for the time being, but before all else to lead them forth into a place of everlasting truth, to inspire them with so lofty a view, to fill them with such high aspirations, that they will come to see, that in spite of all that is claimed for them, the things of life that mean so much in the way of comfort to those who happen to have them, and on the other hand, so much in the way of discontent, if not actual misery, to those who for some reason are deprived of them, are in the end ephemeral and have even a very questionable value while they do last. If this is not correct then it must follow that the greatest characters the world ever knew were sadly mistaken and woefully deceived. What the world needs as much as ever in our age is, on the one hand,

spirit-filled preachers of the gospel who never cease proclaiming this eternally true but with many very unpopular message, and on the other hand, a heart hunger for the imperishable things of life on the part of the people—and materialistic socialists forget this essential fact—who need to be reminded at frequent opportunities of the never failing truth that life consisteth not in the abundance of the things one possesseth. Such a message needs to be proclaimed not only to the poor who in this way are to become reconciled to their position in society, but also just as earnestly and fearlessly to the rich in order that they may come to know that their money and property do not give them an advantage over the poor in God's sight, and, moreover, that their wealth may even be the means of excluding them from the highest blessings of the Kingdom.

The church, then, has to do first of all with the spiritual in man. The very sight of the church building serves to remind men of the claims of the eternal upon them. There is need of such a reminder in our day. The world with its many interests and problems has a tendency more and more to suppress the spiritual element in life. The rush from early morning till late at night is so fast, the competition between men so bitter, the desire for that which the world falsely offers to men so alluring, that men whether rich or poor are in real danger of yielding to the never ceasing pressure upon them, and of resigning themselves unto the pursuit of the passing to the neglect of the permanent. The noise and confusion, the mad rush and the dizzy whirl attendant upon present day life, is of such a nature that men are apt to turn a deaf ear to the still small voice within. Yet what of the day when the spiritual in man will have receded more into the background of life than at present? Who would welcome the time when men were to be less spiritually than they are now? Hence, whatever may be the special function of other institutions, and however well the church may be able to serve men in other ways, she before all else is the one distinctive organ of society that lays stress upon the things of the higher world in their relation to men.

It is in the church that people meet God face to face. It is here that people behold the Lord Jesus Christ in all his excellence. It is here that men are made to see their duty in the light of eternity. It is here that they are reminded at least once a week of things that are of a higher nature than the temporal affairs with which they are compelled to deal for six days. It is here that they are given an opportunity to see themselves in the light of what they really are capable of becoming as compared with the very unsatisfactory selves they know themselves actually to be. And much as they are discontented with matters as they are day by day, and eager too as they are for a readjustment of at least some of the material things in their environment, yet, on the Lord's day and in the Lord's house, they desire to breathe another atmosphere and to hear of other matters than those that are never absent during the week. Hence it is an untruth that the average church goer whose surroundings are not properly adjusted has no patience with the minister of the gospel who comes with a message telling of God in his relation to men, of love and peace and justice and righteousness in their relation to the affairs of man's every day life, without any direct and pointed reference to the specific difficulties of one kind or another by which the people before him may chance to be confronted. Certainly, the message of the pulpit must apply to the life of the people in the congregation and must be related in a vital manner to the problems that they are daily earnestly trying to solve. And ministers should never forget the fact that they are preaching to the men and women of the twentieth century and not to those of the sixteenth. But that does not imply that they are false to the trust imposed upon them if they do not drag the subject of lower taxes, higher or lower rents, capital and labor, strikes and lockouts, child labor, intemperance, houses of ill-fame, immoral films, and what not, into the pulpit. For very often when this is done it is done injudiciously, with less sense than sound and with more noise than knowledge—and the noise cannot but be distracting and the knowledge rarely will

be helpful. And topics like these are apt to crowd out the old but always helpful gospel themes. In no case ought the man in the pulpit even after thorough study of the social problem do any more than present the gospel in a vital relation to it. For it is the preacher's business not to preach socialism, but the gospel of Christ: this of course in its relation to the various problems that men are trying to solve.

But what if there are some people in a community who have no desire to hear the gospel in its simplicity? What if there is a certain number even among the regular flock who would prefer, or who imagine at least they do, a lecture on some phase of socialism to a gospel sermon? Is it not true that in all ages there have been those even among them who were favorably situated in relation to the church who nevertheless had no taste for things spiritual? Let not our appreciation of the gospel in its relation to men touching their deepest needs, our conviction as to its inestimable value to them at all times, blind our eyes to a clear and undeniable fact of history. Much as Christ would have come to the help of the people of the city of Jerusalem, he could not save them from moral decay and spiritual deterioration. Should he not therefore have changed his method of approach to them? Would any one be so bold as to say that he lacked tact in his dealings with the people of the city of his fathers? Who would be so presumptuous as to think even that he should have altered his subject matter and adapted it to the particular people with whom he was obliged to deal? It is a very easy matter, and it ought to be, to recognize the undoubted fact that Christ's first business with men, even with such as were spiritually indifferent or hard-hearted and stiff-necked, was to proclaim the good news of the Kingdom. And men who would not hear that gospel simply would not hear it. They might have been willing to listen to another kind of message, but another kind of message would not have answered the purpose of the gospel. True, Christ adapted his message by parable, clothed in the language of every day life, to the people to whom he addressed himself. But when and

where did he descend from the exalted plane of the gospel? What else but a gospel to man in his relation both to God his maker and to men, children of the same Father, did Christ offer in his day? I see no reason why his messengers to-day ought in the main to seek a different course in their endeavor to help and save men.

Why then this agitation in regard to the essential function of the church? No doubt one of the causes of the difficulty, and one more or less irritating, is the failure on the part of church members, rich and poor, capitalist and laborer, employer and employee, to live in harmony with the standard of life that men generally require them to measure up to. Undoubtedly all who devoutly worship God in his house realize full well that the principles there upheld are not wholly carried out by them in life. That of course cannot be otherwise. But so many people seem to think that church members are not trying honestly to put the teaching of the gospel into practice. The complaint is, we doubt not, legitimate that with some people worship has become an end in itself. There are poor mistaken souls who evidently seem to labor under the delusion that after they have been to church and in some manner taken part in the service they have wholly discharged their duty. These same persons seem not to recognize the fact that while so far as their relation to God is concerned they have done their part, or at least made a good beginning to do it, yet so far as their relation to man is concerned, they have only equipped, or at any rate have had the opportunity to equip, themselves for the work to be done. True, church going is in part an end in its relation to God, but certainly in its relation to men, it is only a means to an end. It is well enough to bow the head in prayer, but it follows necessarily that away from the place of worship the hands should be extended in a service of love unto needy men. It is well that men should unite with others in singing hymns of praise unto the eternal Father, but it is also incumbent upon the sincere worshipper when in society to speak words of commendation from time to time in behalf of

such of his fellowmen as are entitled to them. It is beyond all question expected of the child of God that he listen with the closest attention to the story of God's love for his people, but it follows no less that the one who thus listens ought to go out into the busy world and disseminate some elements of that love among men. In short, Christians in our day, as in all days, should in some effective way unite the religious spirit with that of practical citizenship.

What of the call to social service in our church at this time? Shall we heed or shall we ignore it? It depends upon what the term social service is to denote. It depends upon how the church is to approach the work generally outlined by the advocates of social service. If it means that the church of Christ in our day is to turn aside from the path it has followed for ages and at this time go forth upon a new and untried way, why, naturally, not a few of us hesitate before we are ready to bid her God speed. We not only have difficulty but find it impossible to persuade ourselves that the church by leaving the course she followed from the first would be enabled to serve her Master better than before. We are still of the opinion that the church has entrusted unto her a mission given unto no other institution of which history makes mention. Moreover, we are convinced that the church's business in the first instance is not that of waiting on tables, but rather that of breaking the bread of life: not that of running to and fro after things temporal, however successful, or at least apparently so, some of her branches may be in this respect, but that of ministering unto men in things spiritual.

If, however, on the other hand, social service means that the members of the church are to be more attentive to the message that the church brings unto them, in order that they may lead more genuinely helpful lives and enter more fully into the varied interests of men's daily problems: that they are to make better use of the means of grace, in order that they may be able to go out among their fellowmen and manifest more clearly the Christian graces; that the gospel is to take a more vital

hold on them, in order that they may more simply and helpfully lead the Christ-like life; that they are to ponder more carefully over the word of God, in order that they may the more definitely see and perform their duty in society in their day. Briefly, if social service implies that the members of the church are to be not hearers only but doers as well; that after they have worshipped God in his house they are to go forth and more truly than ever before seek to put into practice the teaching of the gospel in all departments of life to which they happen to be related, and thus transform the world of mankind into the Kingdom of our Lord, then, I am quite sure, not a single thoughtfully minded person would want to say anything else but let us have social service.

There is no reason why members of the church may not ally themselves with extra-ecclesiastical organizations whose main object is to bring about the ends of social service; to do for men all that the champions of social service want the church herself to accomplish in this respect. In fact, I fail to see how people can be faithful members of the church and not heed the repeated calls coming to them from society for help of all descriptions at this time. And the word of God is not preached as faithfully as it behooves us to preach it unless we try to get men to come to the conviction that it is their duty to be thorough Christians in their day, and as such wield an unalloyed influence for good among men and women in all strata of society. It is altogether likely that work of this kind can be done more effectively where people enter upon it banded together into some sort of organization than it can be done by them as individuals. Christians can accomplish far more because they are united into one body than they could bring about as so many separate units. So also can the work to be done along the line of social service be accomplished best if men unitedly undertake the tasks that they have mapped out for themselves in this realm of activity. Only it is well for us at all times to remember that the church herself was not called into being for this end; that Christians are not organized

primarily for social service. They like their Master have a loftier aim in life.

The crux of the whole matter may be illustrated in this manner. On the one hand, the church has no business whatever to enter into politics. On the other hand, we are just as certain that the Christian voter fails to do his duty unless he gets into politics. Again, the church as an institution ought not to meddle in the wrongs of the community or city. But her members unquestionably fail to take to heart the lessons she teaches, or ought to, unless they feel impelled to wipe out the iniquity, of whatever color or description it may be, rampant in the society they know.

It is well for us, for the world, and for the Kingdom, too, if the church as such, on the one hand, steadily adheres to her own unique, spiritual God given mission, and, on the other hand, keeps on supplying the inspiration that will enable her members in a sane and sensible manner to bring about the larger coming of the Kingdom, and then, if need be, even reconstruct our social order.

FREEMANSBURG, PA.

VI.

WHAT IS FAITH?

ELMER L. COBLENTZ.

One of the greatest sins of organized religion is not insincerity but unreality. The Pharisee, as a rule, was not insincere. He was most intense and scrupulous. But he was unreal. He was as St. Paul severely true to his conviction, but his convictions were not true. They had no basis in fact. His standards were fictitious. One of the things that tends perhaps unconsciously to establish and promote this unreality in religion, and especially in organized and official religion, and therefore among the ministry of the church, is the constant and habitual use of the great words of religion without having a clear or potent idea of what these words mean or should convey.

This vagueness, this idolatry of words, this habitual tendency to rest content with words rather than strive for thoughts, with objective symbols rather than subjective spirit based on fact, begets a self-satisfied complacency, a devitalized ministry and a church that may be either a busy mass of revolving machinery or a stately museum of antiquities, according to the temperament of the local pastor, but not a church with a mighty compelling message fraught with great significance for this age and the people who hear it. We deceive ourselves by substituting words for thoughts. "Our words fly up, our thoughts remain below, Words without thoughts never to heaven go," says Shakespeare. Yes, and never go very far or very profitably into other people's lives. De Tocqueville, in speaking of the possibility of freedom, says, "freedom may produce a small distressing motion, a sort of incessant jostling

of men which annoys and disturbs the mind, without exciting or elevating it." So we might say that our religion will only produce a sort of incessant jostling, but can never elevate unless the words we use are not merely revered but actually known to be vital and elevated, because the realities which they represent are clearly grasped and vitally assimilated.

One of the massive mighty words of religion generally and of our Christian religion in particular, which is so loaded down with burdens that it is almost submerged, which has been borne from the world of sane sensibleness, wrapped in the shroud of misty mindedness and transported into the region of cloudy unreality, is the word *faith*. To have it emerge, to restore it, to enlist it in life's efforts with all its glory and power, is a task well worth while, and the doing of which is a real service for our age. The hope of aiding somewhat in this task is the sincere purpose of this paper.

We shall proceed first by a process of negation or elimination.

I. What faith is not, or what is not faith.

1. Faith is not credulity, or credulity is not faith. Credulity and faith are often confused. Faith is often used as synonymous with credulity. Credulity is the accepting of statements or conclusions on slender or insufficient evidence. You tell your child the Santa Claus story—the reindeer, the chimney, the stockings and all. He believes this. There is no feeling of impossibility or incongruity. He does not know the laws of life, of cause and effect and natural sequence. He has no basis of reason. He simply accepts the entire story and the framework of the world in which it sets. We often call this beautiful faith. It is not faith at all. It is simple innocent irrational credulity. When he becomes seven or eight perhaps, he begins to reason how can these things be. Then you say he is losing his faith. No. He never had any faith. He is losing his credulity. He is just trying to gain a faith. He is on his way. Doubt often is the physic which purges the mind of the accumulations of credulity in the in-

terest of faith. We meet our doubts often on our way up, not on our way down.

Because we accept and are content with certain comforting and beautiful beliefs about life and our religion, does not argue that we possess a great faith. It may argue instead an unawakened mind. It may be childish credulity with no more reality than Santa Claus as a physical fat little man. An unthinking easy acceptance of statements without effort or rational ground for verification, no matter how comforting, is credulity and not faith.

2. Superstition is not faith.

Superstition is a mental creation. It is then assigned to the deities and filled with a sense of awfulness and terror. We construct certain mental concepts out of the events of life that seem to be filled with terror. We build up these fancies of ours out of darkened minds, and think they represent the action of the supernatural toward us and our world. Faith is sometimes degraded into the same category with superstition. In many homes there were sacredly secluded the old books of conjuring. There were formulæ in them for the stopping of blood, for removing fire from guns so men could not shoot while on your property, for recovering stolen articles by forcing the culprit to return to your home. Such things were believed most religiously by most people fifty years ago and by many to-day. But the distressing thing is not that they were and are still believed but that they were all interwoven with passages of scripture and concluded with the trinitarian formula and thus they were baptized and consecrated, absolutely as religious faith. I remember with what horror I was gazed at when I said I did not believe them and was told: "Then you do not believe in God if you don't believe these things." Here we have that awful conclusion when faith is identified with a delusion, and is not merely attached to but becomes a superstition. What are the visits to shrines for cures, the kissing of the bones of saints, but gross superstitions, yet all clad in the garments and marching under a banner inscribed faith. Spain spends more money for candles on her

altars than for public education. Is she therefore a nation of great faith? The church needs an investigation upon the high cost of superstition. Do not many of the arguments by Protestants for the efficacy of the sacraments reveal that the idea underlying these arguments is grossly superstitious, making them a kind of *hocus pocus*, or charm, with magical powers? "In his name" or "for Jesus sake" at the end of a prayer is supposed to give it added potency.

Superstition and religious faith have this in common: both have an element or realm of mystery. But they differ greatly as to the nature and effect of that mystery. There is a mystery of darkness and a mystery of light. Walking through the pathless forest by night I am impressed with the strange weird mystery of darkness which partly terrifies and depresses. Walking through that same forest by day with the sun filtering down through the thick branches, with little flowers speaking and nodding to me, I am impressed with the mighty mystery of light which cheers and allures me. Superstition is the mystery of darkness, and leads to greater darkness. Faith is the mystery of light, and leads to greater light. One degrades and terrifies. The other elevates and inspires.

Men who themselves are not superstitious sometimes express a kindly feeling for superstition because it conserves the sense of the mysterious which is a real and necessary element of religion. They seem not to know that to cling to superstition for a touch of mystery is to keep back the finer, greater and more glorious mystery of light. Is not the mystery of the stars to the astronomer who calculates their swing of a greater and grander kind than that of the savage who dreads their peculiar behavior and is terrorized by their supposed control over him? Oh the enchanting mystery of truth, beauty and goodness! Of course it is possible to have a harmless superstition alongside of or attached to a real faith. Frequently we find people with the finest characters whose ideas of the divine control of the world are mainly superstitious and magical. If it always remained thus harmless it would not deserve even a

poor rebuke. When Jesus heard the woman say if she could but touch the hem of his garment she would be healed, he did not deem it worth while to argue the question of magic with her. But if this simple act were constructed into an article of faith or an ecclesiastical ordinance (I am surprised it has not been) and we were asked to pay a high price for the maintenance of a shrine to which we were bidden to come to touch what would be authoritatively called the remnant of Christ's garment with the assertion that it would cure our ills, then it would no longer be a harmless private superstition, to be treated kindly, but a monstrosity to be desperately fought and overthrown.

As Höffding in his *Philosophy of Religion* says, "A man may have his pet if he wants to but he can not be allowed to drive it into the middle of the street and stop the traffic."

In one of his fascinating stories,¹ Henry Van Dyke tells of two young men who upon a journey, after being robbed of all their money except a battered sixpence, stopped at an inn for the night, not with a tale of woe but an air of wealth. Noticing the look of unusual distress upon the face of the innkeeper's wife, they inquired its cause and found it was due to the illness of the little daughter. One of the young men pretends to be a doctor, goes to the sick child, throws the black medicine out and orders the window open, saying "the air to-night is full of silver threads which draw away the fever." Then he took the crooked sixpence, wrapped it in a paper and placed it in the child's hand, saying, "Hold it tight, it will let you in the Garden of Good Dreams." The next morning the child was very much better.

Years after a woman accused of witchcraft is brought before the court. To the judge's question as to how she worked her cures, she replies, "I throw out the black medicine, open the windows where the sick children lie and tell them of the Garden of Good Dreams. Then I put my charm in their hands." The judge demanded the charm and when he un-

¹ "The Return of the Charm," in *The Unknown Quantity*.

packed it he found the crooked sixpence he had given years before to the innkeeper's little girl. He dismissed the woman, who then asked for her charm. The judge replies: "I must keep that, but you may still open the windows, throw out the black medicine and tell the children of the Garden of Good Dreams. That will work wonders." Life must pass from the superstition of the charm to faith in the normal order.

3. Not the blind expectance of benefactions to be mysteriously or miraculously conferred.

Another encrustation upon the word and idea of faith is the feeling that a blind expectancy of help or benefactions from God or the supernatural is faith. In other words, faith is often considered as that quality of the soul or attitude of the mind by which the deity is induced to bestow benefits particularly in the hour of extremity and emergency. If we are sick, have faith and we will be cured though we are killing ourselves by wrong food and poor ventilation. If you are in need have this expectancy tenaciously enough and you will be showered with products in some way. Faith here is made to mean that attitude by which the unseen powers are induced to confer favors and send benefactions miraculously. This is perhaps the most subtle delusion and greatest misuse of the word faith, just because it is so popular and seems so religious. People will tell us to have more faith, meaning nothing other than this attitude of blind expectancy by which benefits for our particular needs may be forthcoming, supplied by an absent God. They quote scripture—"If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, etc.,"² as though that was capable of a literal interpretation and was not an expression of sublime religious poetry. If the desirable and even necessary things could be secured miraculously by such an attitude then why did Jesus send for a mule upon which to ride into Jerusalem? Why send the disciples into the city to *buy* bread, or to make ready the passover? Or why do we spend millions of dollars of people's taxes to get a canal in Panama, or a bridge over

² Mt. 17: 20.

the Susquehanna when this sort of mental or soul attitude usually called faith would turn the trick in a flash? We are asked by pious enthusiasts and zealots to operate our church and other interests on faith, and these so asking think they represent thereby the upper realms of God's special elect speaking down to us who lack this great quality. But they are perverting and degrading the word faith when they use it as this attitude of blind expectancy of benefactions, or support which all sensible men know can only be secured through the normal, rational, social, economic and human processes. We have no right to ascribe the word faith to this passive attitude of expectancy of benefits either in ourselves or others.

Neither should we tolerate any longer the statement that faith is all right but it is no substitute for work. By saying this we still have the old idea of faith as being something that we can not depend upon. If faith is some sort of respectable unreality that can not work, then it might as well be discarded. It is not faith and work, not "either, or," or "both, and," but rather "the works of faith" or a working faith. Real faith itself is a worker and does not seek exaltation by withdrawal from the slow and tedious processes of ordinary life.

4. Not an assent to creedal systems.

Another very necessary distinction to be made is between faith and creed.

Assent to a system of doctrine, which we either have or have not analyzed and found true, or acceptance of a series of historical statements about God and Jesus, is not Christian faith. We often speak of people of the same denomination as of the same faith, whereas we mean they believe or think they believe the same doctrinal system. We often speak of the faith once delivered to the saints as though faith could be delivered to any body at any time, whereas we mean that body of doctrine about God, Jesus, the Bible, and humanity as formulated in the metaphysical terms of the great ecumenical creeds. These products of orientalism, of Greek metaphysics, of

Roman legalism, of Jewish Messianism, of Christian apocalypticism, all woven around Jesus, by the circumstances of the decadent monarchy and the ascending hierarchy, accompanied by all the subtle influences of political intrigue and desire for supremacy, have been ascribed a heavenly origin and declared to have been handed down to earth as the full and final truth of eternity and the test of faith forevermore. To accept the faith means to affirm our allegiance to and belief in these propositions, not because we have found them true but because they are to be believed upon authority. It matters not for our argument here whether these several doctrinal statements are true or not; they are not as such great faith but great metaphysical, philosophical and logical formulations of the intellectual concepts about God and Jesus and the world of that age. Our acceptance of them or saying we accept them is not an act of faith, neither does it put us in possession of a great faith. To say you accept the truth of these on faith is a perversion of the word faith. To think that by accepting them as true you have come into possession of a great faith and have done a meritorious act for which the good Lord will reward you is only a delusion. What we habitually call the articles of our undoubted Christian faith are often the statements of our doubtful Christian knowledge. However true the facts (and there is no desire here to doubt them) that Jesus suffered during the reign of Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried, what semblance of faith is there in them, or in us in saying them. They are historic facts, that took place in a certain time and place and manner, and our assent to the facts is neither an act of faith nor does it put us in possession of a faith.

We can not have faith in a historic fact, in something that is past merely as past. We can know it. We can accept the historian's statement that it occurred thus or so but it is not an article of faith. The very nature of faith precludes the possibility of it being merely the assent to the occurrence of any event. We may say most sincerely and truthfully that

we believe America was discovered in 1492, that the Plymouth Colony came to New England in 1620, that George Washington was the first President and that Abraham Lincoln was born in simple poverty and died at the hand of an assassin, the beloved martyr President, and yet to believe all these historic facts is no great faith either in America or our presidents. This failure to see the difference or rather the identification of faith with assent to historic facts however true has caused most of the terrible theological battles and also agony of soul of hundreds of religious people, when a new interpretation of these facts became necessary. To have more faith does not mean to have more of these doctrinal opinions on historic facts or to hold them more tenaciously or even to have a more correct set of opinions. Faith, Christian faith, is a much simpler thing and much vaster.

II. What is Faith?

Having removed some of the rubbish which has accumulated around this word faith—Credulity is not faith, superstition is not faith, blind and passive expectance of benefactions is not faith, and assent to historic statements and doctrinal interpretations is not faith—we have gained an open sky and a clear path to consider what is faith.

Faith is the venture of life under the impact of the assurance of the reality and worthfulness of the spiritual world and the moral order. Faith is that commitment of the soul to moral ideals in the assurance that they are both real and worthful.

God is spirit and they that worship him must of necessity worship, come in contact helpfully with him in spirit and in truth. This passage is not one of how but where we must worship. God is the ideal achieving spirit, that enforces right conduct by the pressure of his spirit upon and in our spirit. Faith in God is that assurance of the reality of the ideal achieving spirit which enforces, urges and allures us to venture upon the achievement of worthful ideals, viz., the making of a society of worthful persons, or the Kingdom of

God. Faith is the power to see the reality and worthfulness of the kingdom of good will, and the commitment of life to its actualization.

He who commits himself to moral ends, to the supremacy of the soul, lives by faith because he lives in response to the urgency of the spirit of God. He who commits himself to the achievement of the purposes of Jesus, lives by Christian faith because he is responding to the pressure of the truth and righteousness of Jesus upon his soul.

Faith may be at times a sort of great resignation. But it is the rest not of sheer helplessness but of consciousness of power. Faith is trust in truth, and even if that truth seems to be defeated and crucified, it knows that in which it believes to be supreme nevertheless.

When Lowell said,³

“ Though the cause of evil prosper
Yet 'tis Truth alone is strong,
And albeit she wander outcast,
Yet around her I see throng,
Troops of great tall angels
To enshield her from all wrong.”

“ Truth forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow,
Keeping watch above his own.”

he was expressing his great heart faith, his trust in truth, and his conviction of its power even in the dark days of the Civil War. The power of faith is not therefore merely the intensity with which the subject believes, but the reality and greatness of the object of his belief. Trust is not great faith, but trust in truth, in human nature, trust in Jesus, trust in God. One of the marvelous things about life is the power of the subject to appropriate the power of the object. Faith may be called then the religious faculty, the faculty of the soul whereby it

³ *The Present Crisis.*

appropriates the power of the spirit which it recognizes as real and worthful. Faith is the appropriation of power through the admiration of qualities. We become like that which we admire.

"What thou lovest
That too become thou must,
God if thou lovest God,
Dust if thou lovest dust."

THE QUESTION OF EVIDENCE OF SUCH REALITY.

We have said that faith is the religious faculty, the venture of life upon the assurance of the reality and worthfulness of the moral and spiritual world. Now the question arises is there any such reality and can there be any such assurance? Are we simply or terribly deluded? Do we see, apprehend, grasp, rely upon, appropriate, coöperate with a great spirit that engenders confidence, begets power and encourages reliance; or is all this just a notion, an illusion, a subjective feeling unrelated to any reality?

Job's cry, "Oh that I knew where I might find Him," and the poem prayer of Myers,

"Oh! somewhere, somewhere, God unknown, exist and be!
I am dying; I am all alone; I must have Thee,"

are pathetic expressions "of the soul's ceaseless desire for some authentic utterance." But a soul that can not see its God, whose star in the East has been obscured by some intervening circumstance, that has lost the angel faces it has loved long since and yet feels sure they exist somewhere, is not half so pathetic as the soul that says "Is there a God anywhere, even in the obscure shadows?" The most serious question is not "where" but "whether." This question not merely of the locality but the actuality of that which we habitually or conventionally call God has always been with us because we are what we are and the world is what it is. But it seems to be thrust upon us in this age with special severity by the very

mode and method of scientific inquiry; and there is a lurking suspicion that some very damaging and undeniable evidence has been brought by historical and critical experts that makes a decision favorable to religion and faith exceedingly doubtful if not altogether impossible and places those who still persist in speaking of the reality of the spiritual, in the class of the uninstructed.

"There is a widespread impression," says Dr. Clarke, "that the present conditions of knowledge are unfavorable to obtaining evidence of this reality; that it even discredits the old arguments and leaves no place for God. Many think we can spin or construct a beautiful idea of God inspired by all good intentions but it is impossible to affirm that our lovely picture is true. Fancy may worship it but facts condemn it."⁴ Doubt never went so deep. It may be comforting to know it can go no deeper.

If we could look up somewhere in space and see God, or follow a logical process and find God as a conclusion, then we think we could be sure. But we can do neither. Even if in our desperation we, like the youth in the story,⁵ went to Mt. Sinai and climbed its bald peak where Moses stood, there would be only ourselves and silence there and no authenticated presence or voice.

Neither the existence or the character of the spiritual nor its relation to the world can be reached by physical observation or logical demonstration. Spiritual things must be spiritually discerned. Even citations from the Bible as documented revelation instead of solving add to the difficulty. For the question precisely is what was the experience of those who are spoken of in the Bible as having familiar conversations with Jehovah? What did they see and hear? Is that voice now hushed? The Bible, though supremely valuable, is no substitute for a speaking God. It should and can help us to find our

⁴ Newton Clarke, *The Christian Doctrine of God*.

⁵ Quoted in the sermon, "The Voice of God," by Dr. Greene in *University of Chicago Sermons*.

God. The prevalent assumption that the Old Testament characters lived in a realm of special privilege, where they walked and talked in unobscured intimacy with Jehovah as an objective being, is a miserable misapprehension of the Old Testament itself, and the effort to compare and to force our world and thought into that framework is largely responsible for the depressed feeling of doubt of our age. It is like going into the cellar and then wondering about the existence or obscurity of the sun. Our process of discovery of reality moves in the realm of rational and ethical experiences of moral and spiritual qualities.

Instead of regarding the modern scientific and critical habit or method an enemy that has "deified law and outlawed deity" and "taken our Lord away," it should soon be recognized as faith's greatest ally in this hour of serious religious need. Not the least aid of this method, loosely designated Higher Criticism, or New Theology, or Evolution, is the discovery of the realm and the nature of the evidence of the presence and reality of God. If the miraculous were the only or chief region for divine evidence, then surely we would be in a sorry plight, for the miraculous in the usual sense of that term is almost eliminated from the realm of productive and constructive Christian thought. We no longer expect nor "must we ask other people to 'turn aside' to witness burning bushes in order to be convinced of the presence of God. *Religious certainty, religious reality must be found in the things we are now doing.* The prophet must find the evidences in process, law, righteousness, unselfish, loving service of fellow-men. If we can not convincingly show God at work in these things in the life of society, then no volumes of 'supernatural evidences' out of the past can create religious reality."⁶ It should be encouraging, perhaps comforting, to the greatly disturbed that this method, faithfully followed, results in an enlarged, enriched, and confident assurance of spiritual reality.

⁶ Youtz, "The Enlarging Conception of God."—Italics his.

(a) The Realm of the Rational.

Rationality is the normal quality of mental operations. To be rational means to be human, man-like. Now we trust our rationality. We assume its reliability. We admit it may trick us but not all the time. All that we have and expect to get of truth we know must come through our rationality or human nature. Just as we trust our sight and hearing so we trust our rational powers. "We count upon them as generally safe guides. No sane man doubts that it is the very nature of our rationality to lead us to truth. We assume therefore the trustworthiness of these powers."

Another assumption we make is the rationality of the universe. That it is not capricious but operates according to irrevocable and immutable laws. This is the great faith of modern science. It believes ours is an honest world. It assumes that the impress of world phenomena upon the mind is not fooling us and that our reaction is reliable and trustworthy. Newton implicitly trusted the apple, the world and himself. We have rationality therefore meeting rationality. The argument is not that there must be a rational object to correspond with, or because of a rational subject some rational being to correspond with our rationality, but that our rationality is itself the product of rationality which enticed and called forth our rationality. Light does not exist just because my eye exists or to correspond to my eye. But my eye is a testimony to the existence and operation of light which produced my eye. A thoroughly rational world is certainly a greater evidence of a rational spirit than the capricious irrational world of the past into which the absent deity broke on special occasions and in miraculous ways. If rationality, consistency, sanity are always concomitant parts of a sound religious life, then a rational universe is an expression of a trustworthy spirit. God does not have to break into this world to establish his presence and power because he is already in. The usual antithesis between immanence and transcendence is incorrect and unfortunate. Transcendence is not a term of remoteness,

locality or geography. It is a term of quality. To say God is transcendent means He is superior to, not removed from, the earth. Immanence is a term of place and locality. It is not a choice then between immanence or transcendence. It is the immanence of transcendence. The superior transcendent rationality, the transcendent mind, the transcendent God is immanent. This stimulates us to and sustains us in our ventures and is thus faith begetting and supporting, because it assures us of the real presence of God.

"A fire mist and a planet,
A crystal and a cell,
A jelly fish and a saurian, and
A cave where the cave men dwell;
Then a sense of law and beauty
And a face turned up from the clod,
Some call it Evolution,
But others call it—God."

(b) *The Realm of the Spiritual.*

In the realm of right, the realm of ethical and moral qualities and relations, we assume that our ideals of beauty and goodness, and our sense that things ought not to be ugly and bad are reliable and trustworthy. We venture our every day lives upon these primal facts or assumptions, with an assurance that they are not illusions but realities. Just as in the realm of rationality we said that we did not posit an objective rationality merely to correspond to our rationality but that the one begot the other, so here in the spiritual realm, our moral senses result from the activity of a spirituality not ourselves upon us. Hearing did not produce vibration, nor must vibration exist just because we have an ear, but hearing itself is a consequent of the waves of vibration upon an organism that responded. Our moral senses grew and are growing up by such interaction and response. They do not argue the presence in the remote distance somewhere of a God who manufactured us with such faculties, but they themselves are the very presence of that spiritual personality.

In the dedication to his mother of his book *The Religion*

of a Nature Mind, Dr. George Albert Coe says: "A youth complained to his mother that his prayers contained no sure sense that God heard or would answer. The mother replied: 'May not your impulse to pray be God's manifestation of himself to you?'" Is not this exactly what Browning was saying in such lines as: "Hush, I pray thee, may not that whisper be—God?" and Tennyson in *The Higher Pantheism*,

"Speak to Him thou, for He hearest,
And spirit with spirit can meet;
Closer is He than breathing
And nearer than hands or feet."

When Jesus says "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" he is not the victim of a beautiful fancy, but uttering the sanest reality. When we reach into the heart of things and see the moral order and venture our lives strongly upon the assumption that life has a sacred purpose, that it moves under heart throbs of love toward a kingdom or society of good will, we are responding to the pressure of the Infinite upon and in our souls and are no more the victims of self-deception, than when our science ventures upon the assumption of the rationality of man and of the universe. Both go upon great assumptions but such as they feel eminently warranted and justified in making not because of decreetal authority but by the urgency of the actual facts of life. It is time to quit talking about the conflict of science with religion. Science is a great faith. Religion is a great faith. Both are parts of our great venture in life in response to the call of God to and in our souls.

There are conflicts, however, which we can not evade. One is the conflict between science and "supernaturalism." These words represent two different and diametrically opposite methods. Science assumes a world of accurate and accountable causation. Supernaturalism assumes a world into which the deity miraculously intervenes. The man who identifies religion with supernaturalism or deems it essential to religion

of course will feel that science is his enemy, for science is dead set against supernaturalism as a method of world behavior.

But supernaturalism is not religion. It itself is science. So it is the science of normal causation over against the science of occasional and abnormal intervention. It is purely a question of method. The great question of science is *how*. The great question of religion is *why*. One moves in the realm of method. The other in the realm of purpose. Science and supernaturalism both try to answer *how*. They are both scientific, but differ fundamentally in their method. If Genesis says the world was made in six days of twenty-four hours and our geology says it was millions of years in becoming habitable, it is stupid folly to infer that this puts science over against religion and the geologist over against Almighty God. It only puts the science of our century over against the science of theirs, the science of normal process over against the science of miraculous production. Both are questions of "how" and not "why" and have therefore only the remotest connection with the religious problem. If men could only see this they would save themselves much terror of soul, and others much annoyance.

A more serious and far more significant conflict is that between naturalism and religion. These words represent not methods but purposes. They seek to answer not the question "how" but "why." They are each essentially a great faith. They both venture upon the assumption of the reality and worthfulness of certain ideals. But they differ as to their purposes and ideals. The faith of naturalism is not simply that this universe is a big machine but that it has no moral purpose and is just running itself to death. It believes that in our social relations we are drawn together by animal instincts or attracted like magnets,⁷ and are held together afterwards by purely material interests and only so long as we can use

⁷ Hugh Black, *The New World*.

one another for our personal advantage. In business it says stocks and trade, profits and dividends are all, and humanity and morality nothing. What is expedient not what is right, for right is only a platitude, is its code of ethics. It says all this talk about holding and achieving moral ideals, about operating commerce and politics and our human relations and building up a kingdom of brothers under the pressure of God's righteousness and the direction and inspiration of Jesus' principle of wholehearted sacrificial service, is a harmless and pious delusion to which no sensible, practical man will commit himself except for sinister motives or sentimental associations and they who do pretend to so commit or conduct themselves are either hypocritical or non-consequential, or both. Religion is a relic, an outgrown superstition, an abandoned fear. The church is one among a number of other respectable diversions. Christianity is an antiquated set of doctrines, a beautiful, meaningless ritual, or an impossible, social and ethical program.

Not by deliberate choice perhaps so much as by a settled habit this is the faith of thousands both in and out of the church. They walk and act and live by this faith. It has soaked through their life. They feel no pull, no purpose, no meaning in life.

Amiel, at forty-seven, writes: "All the swarm of my juvenile hopes have fled. I cannot conceal my outlook as one of increasing isolation, interior mortification, long regrets, inconsolable sadness, lugubrious old age, slow agony, and death in the desert." Similarly Bagehot says of Lady Montague, "Society is good but I have seen society. What is the use of talking or hearing bon mots? I have done both till I am tired of both. I have laughed till I have no wish to laugh and made others laugh till I hate them for being such fools." This is not philosophic but practical atheism. This is not life but a travesty. Compare this with St. Paul—"Forgetting the things that are past I press forward," "I have fought the good

fight," or Jesus, "Peace I leave with you, my peace give I unto you."

Here is where the real conflict is. Over against all this brutal as well as refined animalism, this Godless and conscienceless naturalism and comfortable selfish superficiality stands Jesus and the real Christianity with its sublime, heroic and daring venture of life upon such ideal interests as unselfishness, beauty, brotherhood, the kingdom of goodwill, with the assurance of the worthfulness of these interests, and the conviction of a spiritual order regnant in the universe. We ministers and church people should feel this conflict above all others, and feeling it we must coin our lives and throw them on the side of idealism against naturalism. When in the conflict our "brows are bloodied beneath the cudgel of circumstance," and our souls stagger, the assembling together and singing,

My faith looks up to Thee,
Thou lamb of Calvary,
Saviour divine,

helps mightily in the great adventure.

CARLISLE, PA.

VII.

COIN AND CHARACTER.

LAWRENCE KEISTER.

Jesus is not commonly classed with capitalists nor often considered as a financier. In the estimation of men He stands for character and not for coin. The fact that He was not the owner of houses and lands, never controlled vast sums of money like the modern millionaire nor ever shaped the financial policy of His own people or any nation has a certain significance. Such ownership and control could not have affected His character unfavorably since far greater power was in His possession and was, in no instance, misused. His character shines as brightly without any relation to coin as with it. It is not hindered in its development, its revelation of itself or its redemptive work for humanity by wealth which was entirely useless to Him in the attainment of all these ends. Coin is incidental and, if needed, is supplied by faithful friends, while character is essential; and the incidental is held in its proper place as entirely dependent upon the essential.

JESUS AND FINANCE.

Since finance was not the primary field of Jesus' activity we may fall into the common error of thinking that He has nothing to do with it; that His ideas and ideals are not operative in this field of life and work; that His conception of honesty and obligation and right cannot be admitted here. But, if He is indeed the light of the world, His light will surely shine with a beneficence as universal as its nature. His teachings must have their influence in every sphere of human activity and the standards He has set become the standards of

men in every walk of life. Failure to consider this fact opens the way for difference of opinion, opposition in action and finally suspicion of intention and even contradiction of character. Mental and moral states cause financial conditions and hence we see that Jesus has something to do with finance and something worthy of our consideration.

The gospels describe Jesus as a poor man without attaching any great importance to this fact. He possessed very little of this world's goods, not more than his immediate need required. Paul tells us that though He was rich yet for our sakes He became poor that we through His poverty might become rich. We think of Him as poor and expect His followers to be more or less like Him in this respect. We half expect the rich man who becomes a Christian to become poor also and the poor man, after this same change, simply to hold his own. Following this course of reasoning we are likely to forget that godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come. We forget that good habits and good principles help a poor man up financially and that good character is one of the chief assets of the banker as well as the preacher. We forget that the vow of poverty may mean as much to the rich man as to the poor man for both can be poor in spirit and both can be rich toward God. The poor may even excel the rich in generosity, as in the case of the widow who gave her two mites. Jesus has made this possible. From the humblest feet He has opened a path to greatness. No other name is given under heaven or among men whereby they must be saved. Wherever and whenever needed salvation points us to Him. In an intellectual crisis, a moral crisis, a religious crisis, and even a financial crisis, there is no other Savior. The tumult of human thought and the conflicting currents of human purpose are stilled at last by the same Voice that calmed the storm-tossed waves of Galilee.

FINANCIAL PANICS AND RELIGIOUS REVIVALS.

The connection between coin and character comes into clear view during a financial depression or a religious revival. Financial panics are closely related to business integrity and business integrity is closely related to moral principle and moral principle is closely related to religious life. Lowering of religious life means a lowering of moral standards and hence of character, and a lowering of character leads inevitably to a lowering of confidence which is regarded as the direct cause of the financial panic. Financial panics resemble revivals of religion in one respect at least, they are periodic. In the financial panic men are discovered to be too human, too naturalistic, too far away from God, too nearly independent of God. In the revival of religion the balance is restored, moral standards are lifted up again and moral considerations weigh once more. Men are honest because they are godly and not because they are under bond and their honesty is of the type that has recognition in high religious circles as well as in high finance.

The New Testament gives us at least two examples of rich men who remained rich after they became Christians, Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea. In the presence of Jesus, Zachæus proposed by his own impulse to restore aught that was not really his own and his fortune was likely reduced by his conversion. He lost coin as he gained character, just as many another man has done. Men who value coin more than character cannot know conversion with its new impulse to do the right thing. Men who value character more than coin hold their wealth on the Christian principle, not for self alone but for others also—"lay not up for yourselves treasure on earth" but broaden your sympathies and raise your ideals so as to include your Christ and your fellow-man. Such money is held as a trust and not merely as a possession. It remains in the hands of the holder for safe keeping and for use but not for his self-gratification or self-glorification.

RICH AND YET RIGHTEOUS.

Jesus more than advised the rich young man when He said, "Go sell all thou hast and give to the poor and come follow me." Was this the only way that man could be rich in character or even be rich at all? Perhaps he knew not how to be rich and righteous at the same time. To be sure he had kept the commandments from his youth up, but had he not lost in character and manhood and holy aspiration? From the comely form of goodness had not the spirit departed? His money was his real master and it led him away from the Christ, though he went with a sorrowful heart. He clung to his coin and his old character in the presence of the Christ and in the prospect of a new character, a new work and a new destiny. He refused to become financially poor in order to become spiritually rich. He refused to be poor as Jesus was poor, for the sake of others, and so he could not become rich as Jesus was rich, for the sake of others.

Jesus declined to take the place of an ordinary judge or administrator in order to settle up an estate and give to each claimant his proper share. He loved righteousness and hated iniquity in business transactions but he never permitted the higher blessings of character to be obscured by the lower blessings of coin. He fed the hungry multitude without request but soundly rebuked them for following Him for the loaves and fishes. His appeal was to the higher motives even when He touched the lower life. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's." Both come into the account but do not mix and muddle things. Do not put civil authority against ecclesiastical authority. Do your duty to both since you receive benefit from both. Never excuse yourself from one duty for the sake of another. Duty is to be done and not quarrelled with and haggled over and set aside. Duty is imperative and not merely advisory, and the ethics that fails to appreciate this quality is as dangerous as it is delusive.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE USE OF OUR MONEY.

The parable of the talents exhibits Jesus' idea of man's responsibility to make use of his money and not merely to hold or hoard it. Money is not for burial in the soil but for use among busy men. The miser misses the meaning and holds it as a selfish good. Many a rich man makes it minister to his own pleasure and greatness and glory, thereby making it hard for him to enter the kingdom of heaven. Coin and character cross or coöperate. Character may be obstructed by coin, may even fall over it and then drop into degenerate ways, or, it may use it for its own advancement and perfection, cultivating generosity and the power of self-control by means of the little disks till they actually minister to the personality of a man like little angels sent to strengthen him.

The servant who hid his talent because he regarded his lord as a hard master, reaping where he had not sown and gathering where he had not strewn—a rather suggestive description of the high financier of our own day—left himself without excuse when the day of reckoning came, a day that always comes and generally comes unexpectedly. He failed to work up to his own conception of his lord who loaned him his talent and so to be prepared to render an account that would prove satisfactory to such a master. His financial crisis proved him to be unfit to control money, for, while he knew its value, he knew not its use and hence lost it, not by speculation but by recall, just as soon as the coin had brought out his character. Religion is not all in the church, not all at the baptismal font, not all in the communion cup, nor even in the closet of secret devotion. A single cent can test a conscience and brand a man as a thief in his own estimation or bring upon him a blessing for his perfect integrity. Such is the power of the spurious coin that continues in circulation after its worthlessness has been discovered.

PRAYER AND ECONOMY.

The original sentence pronounced upon the disobedient still stands. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, but this sentence has been supplemented by the petition, Give us this day our daily bread. The two fit together and form one complete whole. Prayer and work belong together, for prayer fits men for work and work is another form of prayer. When we have done our best work we can offer the fervent, effectual prayer that avails much. The entire man is enlisted, body, mind and spirit, and as all are active so all are receptive. Jesus teaches economy when He says, Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost. What God gives is worthy of man's care and the wasteful habit indicates a loss of character more to be deprecated than the loss of twelve full baskets of fragments. In one instance Jesus seems to teach us to rely upon our ordinary occupation to meet certain extraordinary needs. He sent Peter to the lake with rod and line in order to take the fish that first came up, for it held in its mouth the money to pay the tax Peter had hastily promised, though it was not a legal claim against the Master. Peter's word was honored and no man offended, so careful is Jesus of His disciple's credit and also of the feelings of the tax gatherer, who is sensitive at one point at least. Jesus multiplies bread but never makes it outright, not out of stones, never. He works in the line of God's working. He proceeds with what God has already begun. He takes our crumbs and blesses them into loaves.

THE UNCOMPROMISING CHRIST.

The tables of the money changers placed in the courts of the temple are overthrown by the indignant Master and the men who sat beside them are driven from the sacred precincts. When this same cleansing must be repeated—and who doubts the necessity?—can we not see this same divine Personage causing the same overthrow? We become conscious of His presence, we hear His word of command and perchance we

feel His scourge of small cords, awakened conscience, purified public sentiment and the authority of God's law—a scourge that grows larger in His hand, that smarts and stings, that is brandished over the heads of guilty men and not over the backs of dumb animals. In the temple of God under the touch of Christ coin goes down before conscience and takes its place at the feet of character.

"Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price," says the prophet as he looks into the kingdom of God established on earth by the coming Christ. A commercial transaction can be made without the use of money as the medium of exchange. When money is over-valued by men two ways are open to restore it to its proper place. One is to consecrate it to Christ like the Corinthians did, first giving their own selves to the Lord, their possessions being reckoned as a subordinate part of the gift. When Jesus commanded the rich young man to go and sell all he had He was telling him to get away from his money. He would say to him, You cannot consecrate yourself till you do. You can be a poor man in the kingdom of God, but if you remain rich you will remain outside of the kingdom. You rely upon money, but you must learn to rely upon Christ as the medium as well as the source of all real values and all real excellence.

THE CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE OF EXCHANGE.

The apostles seem to have agreed that two hundred shillings worth of bread was not sufficient for the multitude at the seaside that every one might take a little, yet the blessing of Christ upon a few loaves and fishes produced an ample supply for immediate need, with many fragments left over for future use. The commercial principle and power are not the only ones in existence or in operation and men of money especially are called upon to recognize the higher principle and the mightier Agency which Christ revealed. He uses the creative method of supplying human need. He settles the question of

demand and supply at a single stroke and never raises the problem of transportation, the middle-man, capital and labor, fluctuations in the market and the high cost of living. Money is left out of the account as it is in His redemptive work. Here money utterly fails. A new medium of exchange is required, one that represents value and one that conveys value. The medium employed in redemption equals the purchase and so justifies the transaction. God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life. God gives His love and asks for love in return. If love is a satisfactory consideration to God why not also to man? If to Him it is the supreme consideration why shall it not be the chief thing in all human transactions? Jesus states the case positively rather than dogmatically when He says, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

False financial methods must be overthrown by Christ like every other false and evil thing. Man has but a single Savior. Hence, Christ must confront the money-changer wherever he needs correction. He alone is able to cut between coin and conscience and render a final decision. His eye can detect the love of money as well as the love of God. When coin affects character He is interested in coin because He is interested in character. Seek ye first His kingdom and His righteousness, and food and raiment shall be added unto you. You cannot be Gentiles, as here defined, and also Christians. Regard God as your Father, trust Him for food and clothing and seek His kingdom and righteousness as the real ends of existence. Jesus changes the aim and so the method and outcome of life. He takes away the temptation to adopt wrong methods by removing wrong aims, which, if carried to completion in the field of finance, would be the best possible way to secure a sound financial system.

JESUS MEASURED BY MONEY.

Jesus was sold like a slave for thirty pieces of silver and the bargain of Judas was honored by Jesus when He surrendered Himself. His enemies and one who professed to be His friend fixed the price and He accepted their estimate of His value not only to permit them to have their own way but also to carry out His own great plans. What difference was it to Him whether the price is thirty or three hundred pieces. He was sold and this purchase of the Son of God aided Him in coming to the cross and so becoming the Savior of mankind. Coin ministered to His character as it always must. It helped Him to die for men at the appointed time and place, to redeem men from the guilt and power of evil, to save men from every sin, from every defect of character.

Money had but a small place in the life and work of Jesus, less than in ours, we are inclined to think, whether considered relatively or absolutely. But might it not have had more? Could He not have said with considerable confidence as a financial proposition, Give me a hundred dollars and I will heal that withered hand, Give me a thousand and I will give sight to those blind eyes, Give me ten thousand and I will cleanse that loathsome leper, a hundred thousand and the entire ten shall at once rejoice in perfect health, Give me a million and Lazarus shall come forth from the tomb. He had a monopoly and His help was greatly needed. Men must pay His price or suffer on without relief. But if He had proceeded on this principle how could He say to His disciples, "Freely ye have received, freely give"? He is not working on the commercial principle but on the sacrificial, the Christian principle. He knows where men are but He wants men to know where He is. He was willing to be sold like a slave, condemned like a sinner and perfected through suffering. He deliberately chose to die as the world's Savior and then to rise by the power of God, rise from the rock-hewn tomb and also from the slopes of Olivet.

MEN AND MONEY.

But what shall we do with the thirty pieces of silver, the price of Him Who was valued? Shall we like Judas take them back and cast them down in the temple as the price of innocent blood? Or shall we set them apart to purchase the potter's field as did the rulers of the Jews? Is there no popular benevolence, no convenient charity, no honored institution that can help us hide our commercial wrongs? that will accept our cash and condone our character? But if Christ is still here as He says He is, Lo I am with you always, those thirty silver coins sink in importance as well as in value as soon as we realize His presence and appreciate His perfect character.

The principles of Christ's kingdom have had at least one application in the field of finance, namely, when Ananias and Sapphira were confronted by Peter in a very unusual and unmodern way. He asserted their ownership of both property and price, their freedom to give or retain as they chose but when they gave part as if they had given all he calls their sin "lying to the Holy Spirit," Who is the presiding Presence in the midst of the Christian Church. He regards it treason which requires instant condemnation and immediate punishment. If these two individuals stand for a class, we observe in this instance that the class has no power to change the character of the individuals who compose it nor to relieve them of their personal responsibility. Our processes of thought will affect our own minds and even govern our own conduct but they cannot change the principles of divine justice or the course of divine providence.

Righteousness shows quite as plainly in a business transaction as in the preaching of the gospel or the offering of a prayer. Finance should be an outcome and expression of religion and not the reverse. If coin and character must be related they should be related as mutual friends and not as sworn enemies. They come closer to each other at times than

we are inclined to think. They meet in the word "prodigal," which stands for money and character, the possession of both and the loss of both. "Spendthrift" means the wasting of coin and character. Christianity means righteousness in religion and finance, character like Christ's, service like His and also victory like His, victory over the devil and his delusions, over dishonesty, disobedience and even death.

THE CHRIST AND THE CAPITALIST.

Do we not, then, discover Jesus *above* if not *within* the class we call capitalists? Must we not look upon Him as their real as well as their rightful leader, whose principles must be accepted sooner or later? May we not reverently regard Him as the great financier of the race? Has any other a better right to that place or a better claim to that honor? He saves men from sin and also from poverty, from temptation and trial and also in the midst of both. He lays the deepest foundation for business integrity and commercial confidence. He becomes our righteousness in type and principle and motive. He was rich, but for our sakes became poor that we through His poverty might become rich. He alone solves the problem of poverty. He alone enables men to be rich and also righteous. He alone makes it possible for men to be poor and yet worthy, worthy of His favor and worthy of the respect of their fellows. Nor is He reduced to the narrow necessity of robbing one to enrich another, of taking from the many to favor the few. He gives to all who call upon Him. He places over against the old commandment, "Thou shalt not covet," His own fresh word of promise, "ask and ye shall receive." He teaches men not to prey off each other but to pray to God Who is the source of every good and perfect gift and Who knows no limitation of blessing except the well-being of His children. "No good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly." Honesty is the best principle as well as the best policy and as a principle it is an invocation, a plea for the divine blessing, a pledge to act well its part.

Silver and gold have I none, said Peter to the lame man at the temple gate, but such as I have give I thee: in the name of Jesus of Nazareth rise up and walk. When Christian character becomes the medium of such an agency in securing such results without the aid of money its value becomes visible to the multitude, and when Jesus Christ produces Christian character "without money and without price," and He alone accomplishes this result, men ought everywhere to see in Him their Savior and their Lord Whose authority must be acknowledged in every field of human activity. He is the originator of our best moral standards which ought to be universally accepted if true. He is the Creator of character and hence of confidence. He is therefore the liberator of capital and hence the unseen controller of the currency. He is beside us everywhere and yet above us always and the capitalist may rightfully look upon Him as his superior in the field of finance. He may even see in Him the one and only financier of the race, bestowing abundant harvests, unlocking the treasures hidden in the earth, and giving new knowledge and new inventions just as the progress of the race requires.

Jesus stands out in history as a healer if not a physician in the narrow use of the term; a teacher if not a theologian in the technical sense, a teacher who came from God and who revealed God as a Person with personal attributes and relations; a preacher of righteousness who declared truth in precept and parable, in argument and example till men were constrained to say "never man spake like this man." His mind was as earnest as that of an advocate at the bar and as impartial as that of a judge on the bench. We search in vain for clearer statements of the principles of law than He has given or an equal wisdom in stating a case or conducting an argument. If He has revealed Himself in humility He has revealed Himself also in His superiority. Hence we are called upon to see Him as the superior of the financier and the capitalist, these last leaders of men, leaders who too often seek

cash far more earnestly and successfully than character. His image and superscription may not appear on the coins that represent their wealth but they ought to be found on their characters. His presence ought to be invoked, His power ought to be acknowledged and His principles ought to become operative in every field of their activity. His greatness ought never to be obscured by a lesser but more obtrusive human glory. His humanity is not outclassed by any man however rich and great and influential, while His Deity plainly places Him "high over all, God blessed forever." The financier in his methods of operation and the capitalist in his aims and power of control must therefore seek the assistance of the Christ if business is ever to be lifted to the level that is Christian and made the means of cultivating Christian character as well as amassing fortunes that have no taint of evil and no tendency toward oppression.

SCOTSDALE, PA.

VIII.

THE RELATION OF MORALITY AND RELIGION.

CHARLES PETERS.

Do our religious attainments determine our conduct or is morality independent of religion, is the question under consideration? The answer usually promulgated on this subject is based on the thesis that morality is generically allied with religion and that the former is nothing more than the product of religion as expressed in the practical affairs of life. Hence the statement, "The voice of conscience is the voice of God."

In opposition to this popular position it is often affirmed by eminent writers that the general principles of morality are based upon such sciences as anthropology and psychology and, therefore, the fundamental principles of ethics are not the direct product of any religious tenets. Here there is no vital relationship between religion and morality. Those who hold this view must be classified as materialists or positivists. Consequently, religion has no place in their system of thought.

There is a third position which is being championed by many present-day scholars who maintain that all phases of mental activity are interdependent and concomitant. Hence all rational religious activities—since only rational activities can be utilized in an intelligent presentation of any subject—must be dependent for their form and substance upon all other phases of cognition. Only in this sense can they accept the adage, viz., "As he thinketh within himself so is he." Religious belief and practice, like morality, consequently involves the whole range of human thought and human experience. Religion and morality, therefore, are interdependent, not only on one another, but both are dependent upon every form of

human experience. The writers committed to this third position must be classified among the disciples of interactionism.

In our discussion of this subject we will endeavor to disclose the fallacies of interactionism and materialism in order to set forth the valid relationship between morality and religion.

The true relationship of morality and religion involves also the fundamental relationship of mind and body. This latter relationship must be clearly comprehended if we would properly relate religion and morality. If we agree with the dualistic interactionists that mind and body are two separate and distinct entities which interact upon each other then the first position, as above stated, is untenable.

Descartes, the father of modern philosophy, was led to advocate the doctrine of dualistic interactionism. But because Descartes was a critical thinker, he could not consistently hold to the doctrine of the interdependence of mind and body. In the final analysis, he was obliged to adopt the *a priori* argument that mind and matter were simply forms or modes in which the underlying all-comprehending Substance expresses itself. Moreover if mind and matter are modes of the same all-comprehending Substance they cannot be radically disparate and unrelated. They must, at least, have the essence of the underlying Substance in common. Furthermore, if mind and body were completely disparate and unrelated then man would become a mere automaton, since mind and body would be mere vehicles for this universal Substance. According to this theory there would be no place for human freedom. Thinking would become a mechanical process and errors would be impossible.

We must agree with the dualistic interactionists in this, that mind and matter are interrelated but we deny the thesis that they constitute two separate and distinct entities. We maintain rather that mind and body are interrelated in that they are complementary expressions of the same reality. We assume with Descartes that there is an underlying all-compre-

hending Substance common to both mind and matter. This relationship will become more apparent if we couple this view with Kant's great contribution to philosophy, viz., that mind creates the forms of space and time. We must conclude, therefore, that the underlying Substance must be akin to mind, since it actuates both mind and body of finite individuals. Furthermore, since the physical is known, dealt with, valued, etc., by the mind, consequently, we say that mind expresses itself through matter and we therefore maintain, that morality and religion are not merely the product of human thought or mental activity but they are the product of the all-comprehending Substance or Supreme Mind which expresses itself through the finite mind. Religion might therefore be appropriately defined, "As the mind of God manifesting itself in the life of man." Consequently, we hold that the popular conception concerning the relationship of morality and religion, viz., that morality is nothing more than the product of religion, is the only theory which accords with the salient facts of human experience.

With regard to the second position relative to the development of morality independent of religion, *i. e.*, independent of divine coöperation, we need only consider the same with reference to valid causality in order to prove its untenability. It was stated in connection with this position that its sponsors were obsessed with materialistic tendencies since they based their claims, *in toto*, upon the scientific data mediated to them through such channels as anthropology, biology and psychology. It is not the purpose of the writer to minimize the importance of scientific data nor to cast any reflection on scientific facts. Our contention is rather, to the effect, that science can never consistently base any phenomenon or attainment, such as morality, upon the theory of naturalistic causation without encountering, as Professor Bowne says, "a nest of contradictions."

On the basis of what was said in connection with interactionism we can explicitly state that there is no interaction of

things, but only the fixed order in which concomitant changes occur. Science is therefore restricted to the realm of observing and classifying the behavior of physical elements. Scientific observers who advocate the theory of naturalistic or efficient causality are not only guilty of gross presumption but they are likewise irrational. Hume's contention, that nature reveals only a succession of events and nowhere discloses sequential causation, is irrefutable. Furthermore, those who advocate mechanical or naturalistic causation are hopelessly involved in such fallacies as meaningless time, the infinite regress, a barren tautology, the Heraclitic flux, etc.

In order to establish the spuriousness of naturalistic causality relative to the contention that morals and society can be explained on a naturalistic basis, it will be necessary to briefly discuss the fallacies just designated.

Kant has plainly demonstrated that the category of time is purely phenomenal. We therefore rightly contend that no being has literally an existence in time, otherwise our existence would be a "flow" without identity, without unity, and without abiding. If we would however maintain that the past and the future are distinct entities and account for the same on a naturalistic basis we would be obliged to maintain that the future is grounded in the past. But if the future is grounded in the past there is no distinction or disparateness respecting these two eras of time. We cannot say therefore that the future is produced by the past, since we cannot maintain a definite distinction between these two entities. Nor will the naturalistic position be made less irrational by advocating that the future is potentially included in the past. Since potentiality must also be somewhat of the nature of actuality (relative to time when considered as an independent reality), we therefore do not alter the above position and our conclusion, viz., that we cannot make a definite distinction between past and future time, must be maintained. Potentiality, properly considered, can only be applied to free personality, i. e., a personality that can initiate or withhold action. Hence we

say that the past does not cause the future, no more than winter produces spring.

In contrast to the devotees of naturalism we maintain that both the past and future are phases of an all-comprehensive movement which has its origin in an intelligent free agent. Those who hold that all causality inheres in antecedents are committed to the theory that the "future is pushed out of the past." On the other hand, those who hold that causality is due to a free intelligent agent maintain, that the present is determined with reference to the future, also, that there is a comprehensive forward movement which has for its goal the realization of the will of the Omnipresent Moral Personality. Hence the adherents of final or personal causation accept the theory of evolution based on final or purposive causality as over against mechanical evolution based on naturalistic causality.

When we consider the theory of mechanical or purposeless evolution to which the materialists are committed we encounter a number of irrationalities. The theory of evolution proper is nothing more than a convenient system of classification in which various organisms resembling one another are placed into groups called species, etc. A grave fallacy is introduced when this system is regarded as the repository of causality. Materialists hold that organisms are either resolved into small particles of matter which represent mere force or else they maintain that there is a moving power behind matter. We are opposed to this mechanical theory of causation because it is evident that a purposeless energy could do nothing more than move matter in a promiscuous fashion. An intelligent power alone could fashion and perpetuate a cosmos instead of chaos.

We should also note that if the cause inheres in the antecedent then we are obliged to admit that causality is represented by an infinite regress, since each explicit cause can be pushed back upon another antecedent and so on *ad infinitum*.

Again we should take recognition of this fact, viz., if cause is synonymous with the antecedent then indeed we are committed to a closed system in which cause and effect are equiva-

lent to a barren tautology. There can be no progress in a system in which the cause is commensurate with the antecedent. It is also evident that all of the cause and nothing but the cause must constitute the effect. Hence there is no progress in this system.

There are many scientists, however, who see that it is futile to maintain that causality inheres in things or antecedents, they therefore contend that there is an abiding energy behind the objects of space and time which is the primary cause of all occurrences. When we consider the possibility of an impersonal cause behind all phenomena we are again confronted with unsurmountable objections. We are here face to face with the Heraclitic anomaly of change and identity. It is impossible to maintain any identity in a system of change apart from the unifying activity of an abiding personality. Furthermore, there is no room for progress or development in a system of mechanical, purposeless force and matter. Mechanical energy can never account for psychical characteristics such as color, sound, size, etc. There is absolutely no physical connection between a certain number of vibrations on the cortex of the brain and the various psychical characteristics or qualities. Yet we admit that physical and psychical events appear to be concomitant. We, therefore, conclude that the underlying all-comprehensive Substance manifests itself simultaneously in both physical and psychical domains.

Summing up now the gist of the above discussion relative to the plausibility of the development of morality on a naturalistic basis apart from religion, we are obliged to admit that no moral progress or development is possible except the same is grounded on the Divine Personality. Morality, therefore, must be considered as the product of religion since all development is dependent upon the activity of the all-comprehending Intelligent Personality.

Admitting that the Divine Personality is the Primary Cause of all progress it remains for us to qualify our position in order that the theory relative to the Supreme Personality does

not preclude the fact of human freedom. It is obvious that moral individuals must possess prerogatives or else the thesis concerning man's morality must be ruled out of court. Consequently, we cannot hold to the Cartesian idea of an underlying universal Substance without investing the same Substance with personal characteristics. Neither can we accept Leibnitz's theory of preëstablished harmony relative to this underlying Substance. We are likewise compelled to enlarge upon Paulsen's conception who held that all activity, whatsoever, is due to the inner realization of one fundamental purpose. Paulsen's unguarded delineation of ultimate causality would entwine us in the meshes of pantheism and characterize the individual as a mere automaton. Furthermore, evil and error in this system must ultimately be given a place in the one fundamental purpose.

In order to account for human responsibility in the scheme of morals we must conceive of human freedom in the terms of self-direction and human initiative. We believe that the conception of personality relative to both the supreme being and to human beings makes it possible for us to account for human freedom. If man possessed an absolute personality he would possess absolute self-control and he would also be absolutely self-sufficient and independent. But since man's range of activity and range of knowledge is limited he cannot enjoy absolute freedom. Yet man is endowed with the possibility of increasing his knowledge and self-direction and for that reason he feels responsible for his acts be they good or evil. Man, therefore, because he is endowed with the possibility of enlarging his personality, is a moral being. Man, however, can only realize this larger personality by conforming to divine law. Hence the individual who would develop a moral character must coöperate with the Supreme Personality.

In order to further corroborate this position we might state that a similar conclusion relative to the problem of epistemology is entertained by eminent scholars to-day. These writers maintain that a Supreme Mind or Supreme Spirit is the Pri-

mary Source of human cognition. The most satisfactory explanation concerning the process of knowing might be briefly stated as follows: First of all we distinguish between the "self" and the "not self." The "self" acts on the "not self" and by the resultant reaction the nature of the mind is revealed. Hence, what we cognize in the external world are mere phenomena or reproductions of the mind. We are obliged to admit that there is an external something in which a certain degree of permanence is manifested. This is evident when we remember that under similar conditions the mind always reproduces the same external stimuli in identically the same form or substance. Also when a number of individuals are subject to the same external stimuli they generally interpret like stimulation in identically the same manner. Now these external stimuli would have no meaning for us were it not for the fact that an Intelligent Creator employs the symbols of the external world to communicate with finite intelligent beings. Just as two intelligent persons converse with one another and exchange ideas by means of some common symbols so nature furnishes the medium whereby the Infinite Spirit communes with the finite spirit. Thus God utilizes the external world as a medium for the promulgation of knowledge among human kind. Nature determines subject matter for the finite mind. The mind of man, in turn, unifies the various sense impressions as they enter the mind and abstracts ideas from them.

This theory concerning the source of knowledge accords with the principles for the development of an approved moral and religious character. Josiah Royce in his treatise, "*Sources of Religious Insight*," where he writes concerning the fundamental propagation of religion and morality, claims that the source of our religious and moral progress is based upon our social experiences which transcend individual experiences. The need of salvation expressed by the individual is due to the natural narrowness of that individual's life. A man may, however, correct or overcome his own narrowness by entering into the life of his fellows. Because of the extensiveness of

the social world and because of the discipline the individual derives from social contact man neutralizes his inner conflicts by failing to make room for individual caprices. Therefore, the goal to the highest life is through social experience. "Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it." Royce goes on to say in substance that man is fundamentally linked with his fellows. Man can only be saved by the help of others. Salvation consequently would imply the deliverance from individualism by devoting one's life to the common weal. Failure to concentrate upon the altruistic over against the individualistic interests of life will result in a bitter bankruptcy of the true self. We beg to repeat: failure to dedicate oneself to the highest purpose of life will sooner or later develop a consciousness that the whole life is vapid. Or to use the words of Royce, "The whole life, for the time being, is wrecked." Thus the consciousness of worthlessness, perdition and despair, is the first step in the process of deliverance from a narrow individualistic uncharitable life to a magnanimous and felicitous life.

A number of classic illustrations portray this universal need of salvation. We cite from among a number Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*. Here the poet vividly depicts the guilt that torments the individual who disregards the supreme ideal of life. The unfortunate mariner represents an individual who is self-centered and capricious. He wantonly and maliciously opposes the universal principle of love and righteousness. Later on, this unsympathetic and unscrupulous individual realizes that he has rebelled against the very essence of life by ignoring the all-pervading universal principle of love. Finally, he realizes that even his comrades have forsaken him and have anathematized his unfraternal disposition. His deliverance from this degenerate condition had its inception in the initial awakenings of love toward all living beings. He finally triumphs over his unscrupulous and morbid life when

his heart responds to the principle of universal love which is thus expressed by the poet:

"He liveth best who loveth best,
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all."

Salvation, which is the chief concern of religion, accordingly means, the deliverance from a narrow unsocial disposition by responding to the divine altruism. Hence morality is the product of such a divine disposition.

In other words, we conclude that religion and morality are fundamentally and generically related. Or, to draw an inference from Royce, if salvation means the adjustment of one's views and one's life to the all-pervading and all-comprehending unity that binds the world together, then indeed we must grant that morality which seeks the highest good for the individual reaches its highest degree of development when the individual is in close relationship with the Infinite.

In order to set forth the relationship between morality and religion in a more popular form we should consider the essence of both religion and morality and from their nature determine their relationship. Hence we venture to say that that individual is moral in the broadest sense of the term, who strives after moral perfection. This view is quite generally accepted in the philosophical writings of the Greeks as well as by the exponents of the Christian Church. "Be ye perfect even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect," is the standard of moral perfection taught by the Christian Church. Likewise the Greeks maintained that perfection was the *summum bonum* of life. In the second place we regard it necessary to state that there are various divergent views relative to the method whereby perfection may be obtained. Again, there is no universal agreement as to what should constitute the highest individual attainment.

Regarding the first of these propositions in question we must remember that many able and sincere men and women do not agree that organized religion furnishes the method

whereby the highest individual attainment is possible. Many scientists, materialists, atheists and sceptics hold that the individual should strive to develop the highest possible moral character, yet they do not believe that organized religion is the scheme whereby this development may be accomplished. Organized religion on the other hand maintains that man may reach the highest possible goal of human attainment by allowing the Supreme Personality to actuate and mold his being. Hence the devotees of religion seek communion with the Supreme Personality. The Supreme Personality must share life with us and we in turn must share life with others. Consequently, in this way a gradual righteous transformation is wrought within, as is vividly portrayed in such popular books as *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*.

In order to appreciate the theory concerning the contact of personality it will be necessary to remember Kant's explanation relative to the objective world. According to psychological verification we are certain of this fact that the vibrations or sensations from the objective world constitute the only direct consciousness we have of the external world. The appearance of form and size of objective things is nothing more than the mind's representation of the cortical vibrations. Space and time are no real entities *per se*, they only are phenomenal representations of the mind. Hence we can well say that the influence of personality is not restricted by external limitations. Likewise the influence of the Supreme Personality is not obstructed by external things. Therefore whenever we permit our finite and narrow beings to reconnoitre in accordance with the Divine Personality we experience the fullness and joy of life. Jesus said, "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest, take my yoke upon you and learn of Me." Religion which represents the relation between man and the Supreme Spirit is the basis for the development of the highest form of morality. Organized religion aims in a very definite way to make the life of the individual conform to that of the Supreme Personality.

It is the attempt to bring the "Life of God into the soul of man." Morality, on the other hand, as a science, deals largely with the virtues and characteristics of the perfect life. Morality does not give the individual the power to realize the perfect life. Organized religion alone makes it possible for the individual to attain to the highest moral character by seeking to cultivate a close relationship between the individual and the Supreme Personality and by responding to the Divine Will in the practical affairs of life.

Finally, we must ask what constitutes the highest goal of human attainment? What is the *summum bonum* of life? The Greeks placed wisdom in the front rank of the foremost virtues of a perfect life. The truly wise according to the best philosophy of the Greeks were always likened unto the gods. The Christian Church likewise teaches that the standard of moral perfection must include wisdom among its cardinal virtues. The same may be said of the other cardinal virtues maintained by eminent Greek philosophers such as fortitude, temperance and justice. All these are virtues that must be applicable to the perfect moral character. But the basic virtue, the *sine qua non* of perfection, is comprehended in the Christian conception of love. It has been aptly said "that a character may be as pure as snow and as cold as ice." Similarly, we would say that should it be possible for an individual to realize all the virtues of a perfect life, save this distinctive Christian grace comprehended by the term love, the individual might indeed be pure, but his disposition would be as frigid as the Arctic snow. The individual must respond to the divine all-pervading love of the Supreme Being in order to develop a moral character of the highest excellence.

In conclusion we would maintain that morality in its highest expression is fundamentally and generically based upon the proper religious development of the individual. Morality is nothing more or less than the religion of the individual manifesting itself in the daily affairs of life.

JUNIATA, PA.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

RELIGIOUS RHEUMATISM. By J. B. Baker. Boston: Sherman, French and Co. Cloth. 220 pages. Price \$1.35 net.

The title of this book is, to say the least, a somewhat unusual one for a collection of sermons by a Lutheran minister. Intended, no doubt, to be arresting and fetching, it smacks too much of sensationalism to be as appropriate for these discourses as many another that might have been chosen for its name. Nearly all of the sixteen sermons comprising the contents of the volume represent earnest, painstaking effort on the part of the author to furnish his readers and hearers inspiration and light, comfort and cheer along the upward road and amid the perplexing experiences of life's rough and dusty journey. The sermons deal less with the great doctrines and foundation truths of the Gospel—as the title under which they are published, of course, at once suggests—than with the practical ethics it enjoins, the services and sacrifices it evokes, and the spiritual aspirations it arouses and sustains. They abound in apt and forceful illustration gathered by the author from his manifest wide acquaintance with historic, biographic and poetic literature. They bear the impress of a preacher's fine intellectual equipment, of his strong moral convictions, of his high religious ideals, and of his rich personal experiences as a Christian. All these must combine to make Mr. Baker's pulpit ministrations very acceptable and helpful to his people—they give to his sermons in print unusual attractiveness—an attractiveness which the book's unfortunate title tends to hide rather than to make known to the public whose interest it should invite and deserves to receive.

A. S. WEBER.

THE SOCIAL TEACHINGS OF THE JEWISH PROPHETS. By William Bennett Bizzell. Boston: Sherman, French and Co. Cloth. 237 pages. Price \$1.25 net.

The attitude of the Jewish prophets toward the social questions of their day was very similar in many respects to that which modern sociologists assume toward present-day social problems. Dissatisfaction with conditions prevailing among the ancient Jews, the Hebrew seers attempted to show, were due to "man's inhumanity to man," to their lust for wealth and power, to their selfishness and injustice in social relations. In the name of the just and righteous God, they advocated a reconstructive program

for society, the importance of which for our times is recognized by students of the Old Testament Scriptures, and its underlying principles commended by them as applicable to the conditions and needs of to-day.

President Bizzell belongs to the growing group of students who are devoting themselves to the investigation of the Hebrew Scriptures and deriving from them important instruction for our own times. His present study is only one of the books which scholars of his class have in recent years been publishing on this subject and with a common end in view. The value of this new contribution lies in its clearness of statement and methodical arrangement, rather than in an originality of results presented. As a teacher, Mr. Bizzell has had occasion and opportunity of going over the vast field of Old Testament inquiry, and from it has gathered and arranged his findings in this volume and adapted them to classroom purposes. The footnotes and the lists of readings suggested at the end of each of the chapters makes it available to teachers of Bible-Study classes as well as to private students of the Hebrew prophets.

A. S. WEBER.

THE GIFT OF MIND TO SPIRIT. By John Kulamer, Esq. Boston: Sherman, French and Co. Cloth. 227 pages. Price \$1.35 net.

In several introductory pages, "confidential to the reader," the author of this volume gives us interesting biographical information, tells us how the book came to be written, and expresses the hope that its aim to bridge the chasm between religion and science may afford help to those who are traveling, as once he did, along the road of doubt. Mr. Kulamer is a layman, a member of the Pittsburgh Bar, and evidently a gifted and thoughtful student, not only of the law, but of theology, science and history as well. He was born and bred in the Roman Catholic Church, pushed along by an ambitious father toward the priesthood as far as the study of an antiquated and superseded philosophy. Against the mental limitations of that philosophy and its dogmas, together with its effects upon life and character as he saw them, he revolted. He clung for a few years "to the raft of the Roman faith, but his hold upon it was fast loosening and growing weaker." Presently he was compelled to put his trust "in the open sea of doubt and sink or swim alone, rather than to depend upon a contrivance which seemed to be disintegrating." Afterwards he found his way under evangelical leadership into "the folds of a church whose position is to allow the mind a free rein to investigate the mysteries of nature and the vital questions of life without binding it down with dogmas or articles of faith, and whose main purpose is to harmonize man's everyday actions and experiences with the great truths as his mind perceives them." His

vision now has cleared; he has not found the absolute truth, but he is satisfied with the conclusions so far as he has reached them. He believes it better to err honestly through one's own efforts than to permit oneself unresistingly to be led into and kept in error.

The six chapters into which Mr. Kulamer has divided his closely articulated and forceful discussions, bear the marks of a great mental struggle in earnestly and patiently searching after the truth. In the first of these chapters the writer deals with the conflict between religion and science; in the second he discusses the first principles of metaphysics and psychology in the light of modern scientific theories; in the third he treats the question of individual immortality; in the fourth he states what he regards as being the essentials of common-sense ethics; in the fifth he aims to put a soul into business and to restore it to the life of the home; and in the sixth he pleads for a rational theology and religion which shall harmonize with the civil institutions of America, and points the way towards the putting of a soul into the life of our government. Much that the author says upon these important topics is illuminating and instructive, and, even though it is not always convincing or satisfying, it may be read with not a little interest and profit.

A. S. WEBER.

THE ESSENTIALS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. By Charles W. Heathcote. Boston: Sherman, French and Co. Cloth. 290 pages. Price \$1.50 net.

The author of this textbook is the instructor of religious education in the theological department of the Temple University, of Philadelphia. The president of that institution, the Rev. Russell H. Conwell, writes an appreciative introduction to the volume. In it the author's attainments as a Biblical scholar and his skill as an instructor receive kindly mention, and the opinion is expressed that the purpose and nature of his work in these pages will make all its Christian readers glad.

A careful perusal of its eighteen chapters bears out Dr. Conwell's appraisal of the high value and practical usefulness of the volume and of the broad scholarship of its author. It is the outgrowth of the writer's work with students in the classroom, and well adapted, therefore, for similar use by other teachers of training-classes, and as well for private reading. It presents the historical, the psychological and the practical sides of religious education, emphasizes the great essential truths of the Christian Scriptures, suggests methods of instruction, and shows the way along which organized effort can achieve the best results under the leadership of pastors, Sunday School teachers and parents. The book is thoroughly wrought out, and will prove itself of great service to those practically interested in the subject which it treats.

A. S. WEBER.

PARADOXICAL PAIN. By Robert Maxwell Harbin, M.D. Boston: Sherman, French and Co. Cloth. 212 pages. Price \$1.25 net.

The problem of pain, to the study of which many thoughtful minds have given careful attention, is studied anew in these pages. Than physicians, no class should seem to have better opportunity and advantage for carefully observing the source, the effect and the meaning of physical, mental and spiritual pain. Day after day, in the practice of their profession, they are brought into close and intimate contact with human suffering in some of its forms. In addition to his professional advantages as a medical practitioner, Dr. Harbin brings to the production of this book a fine psychological equipment and a deeply religious spirit, and the result is an uncommonly interesting presentation of this important subject under various aspects.

In a foreword, he points out that in studying the question of pain there are two opposing forms which it appears need to be clearly differentiated: One of these serves sooner or later some beneficent purpose and is constructive in its effects. The other is essentially evil and harmful, and, therefore, destructive in its consequences. It is the first of these that he describes as "Paradoxical Pain"—the pain decreed by a Wise Order, and to be regarded, accordingly, not merely as an incident of beneficent purpose, but as the necessary cause of the greatest and most enriching blessings of human life.

In the physical realm, by way of illustration, the author shows that vaccination is an instance of paradoxical suffering, the design and outcome of which is preventive, helpful, conservative, as is abundantly shown by the contribution it has made to physical immunity against one of the most dreadful and destructive diseases. In the intellectual realm, progress and superiority are gained in a like manner, only by painful and laborious efforts. Moral excellence and stability can be won, not by idle sentiment, but by practices that involve many painful self-denials and personal sufferings. In the region of the spirit, where the crowning traits of character appear, Dr. Harbin makes it plain, the same law reigns. The fundamental doctrines of all religions, and especially of the Christian religion, are based on the recognized necessity of our undergoing painful experiences, such as cross-bearing, self-sacrifice, tribulation, etc., and that from these the beauty of character and the abiding joys of life issue.

The discussions of these topics along the lines thus imperfectly indicated, cover seventeen chapters, all of which are done in a most engaging spirit, and with an insight and ability not equalled by any writer on the subject since the appearance, more than forty years ago, of Dr. James Hinton's classic on the "Mystery of Pain." The latter work occupies similar ground, but its author was not required at the time he wrote, to meet the denial of the

reality of pain, or to overthrow the view that all pain is evil—conceptions now promulgated by certain would-be religio-scientific leaders of the thought of our day. Dr. Harbin has made a valuable corrective contribution to Christian literature. His book deserves and will reward a careful reading.

A. S. WEBER.

THE FAITH OF ROBERT BROWNING. By Edward A. G. Hermann. Boston: Sherman, French and Co. Cloth. 50 pages. Price 80 cents net.

The literary artist whose brilliant study of "Robert Browning" many regard as holding title to the first place among the numerous books on the subject, begins his work with this sentence: "On the subject of Browning's work innumerable things have been said and remain to be said; of his life there is little or nothing to say." Chesterton's keen and sagacious knowledge of Browning's work, and his deep appreciation of the complex genius manifest in Browning's life, led him to declare "that it is a great deal more difficult to speak finally about his life than about his work." This is true whether one attempts to speak about one or another of the constituent elements of that life—its religious faith, its philosophic basis, its spiritual aims, or its moral ideals—as reflected in the wealth-laden work it has standing to its credit. Such a life, Mr. Chesterton sees, is essentially a life of mystery, and exceedingly difficult, therefore, of a definite and conclusive interpretation. From it have come utterances which, if not plainly self-contradictory, are irreconcilably at variance with one another as regards the significance and bearing of the content. Hence the widely divergent conclusions arrived at by students of Browning's life.

In the essay before us, which shows not only the author's scholarly attainments in the department of the history of religious thought and of its attitude during the nineteenth century, but also an admirable and sympathetic acquaintance with Browning's poetry and the contribution it made toward the advancement of religious thought along scientific lines, Mr. Hermann undertakes the task described above as exceedingly difficult. Not a few would regard it an impossible task—to show the soundness of the poet's faith with reference to many of the foundation truths of orthodox Christianity. From its own viewpoint, and within the brief area it covers, the essay succeeds remarkably well in showing the rare beauty and the richness of Christian faith which Browning has made the characters he portrays to express. His quotations are aptly made with an eye to render the service he needs in support of his contentions. But whether these quotations express the poet's own convictions is not sufficiently certain to enable one to speak "finally," as Chesterton has it—that is, with entire confidence—on the subject. His bishops, and princes,

and churchmen, and heroes, are made to utter different views with equal assurance as to their validity, and for this Browning has been criticized and blamed, and his orthodoxy seriously questioned. In spite of all this, however, Mr. Hermann's interpretation is probably valid—probably being the qualifying word needed to endorse the author's views.

A. S. WEBER.

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Edited by Gerald Birney Smith. The University of Chicago Press. Pp. viii + 759. Price \$3 net.

The title suggests the nature of this substantial volume. It is written mainly to furnish expert orientation and guidance to students in the study of the Christian religion. It desires to aid them "to understand the meaning of the various aspects of education for the Christian ministry." In order to achieve this difficult aim, the editor has asked a group of competent specialists to coöperate. Accordingly, this book consists of twelve solid chapters, contributed respectively by William H. P. Faunce, Shailer Mathews, J. M. Powis Smith, Ernest DeWitt Burton, Edgar J. Goodspeed, Shirley J. Case, Francis A. Christie, George Cross, Errett Gates, Gerald B. Smith, Theodore G. Soares, Charles R. Henderson, and George B. Foster. The chapter headings are as follows: Preparation in College for the Study of Theology, The Historical Study of Religion, The Study of the Old Testament and the Religion of Israel, The Study of the New Testament, The Study of Early Christianity, The Development and Meaning of the Catholic Church, The Protestant Reformation, The Development of Modern Christianity, Systematic Theology and Christian Ethics, Practical Theology, Christianity and Social Problems, The Contribution of Critical Scholarship to Ministerial Efficiency.

The names of the contributors guarantee the scholarly character of the book, and their subjects reveal its extraordinary scope. No significant phase of the study of the Christian religion is left untouched, and each one is set before the student clearly and succinctly. The book does not attempt to enter into a detailed study of any branch of theological learning; nor does it seek to supply encyclopedic information. Its aim is to show the meaning of theology in all its parts, to explain methods of study, and to suggest the best means for the mastery of any particular topic in the carefully chosen bibliographies which are added to each section. No attempt, of course, has been made "to secure absolute uniformity of views." Yet, the volume is not a mosaic of unrelated fragments. All of the contributors use the same method, and are inspired by the same motive. Their method is historical, yielding scientific results; and their motive is practical piety, leading to intelligent aspiration and consecration to the Christian ministry.

Hence, unity of thought and purpose, if not uniformity of opinion, pervade the entire book. A fine, healthy open-mindedness is typical of each chapter; and positive, constructive convictions are the terminal of every discussion.

Prophesying is not part of the reviewer's task. But we venture to predict that no recent book in the theological world will receive a warmer welcome than this composite volume. Certainly, none fills a bigger gap in libraries nor supplies a greater need in seminaries. Nothing like it has been attempted by American scholars since 1893, when Philip Schaff published his excellent *Theological Propædæutic*. But, meanwhile, the study of theology has experienced a renaissance. Even the title of this new volume suggests the transformations that have taken place within a generation. The older book was a *theological* propædæutic, but the present writers furnish us a guide to the study of the *Christian religion*. The emphasis has been shifted from theology to religion, from the circumference to the center. The application of the historical method of study has added vastly to our stores of knowledge in every field of theological research. Psychology and philosophy have given us new perspectives and longer vistas of truth. The unfolding life of mankind sets new tasks for the church, and presents difficult problems to religion.

With all its merits, Schaff's *Theological Propædæutic* is wholly inadequate to give the student a bird's-eye-view of the field of study that challenges his attention to-day. And, hitherto, the very difficulty of the task to provide competent guidance in a field of ever widening boundaries and shifting landmarks, has discouraged scholars from attempting to follow the example set by Dr. Schaff. But Wernle, in 1908, pointed the way to a new kind of propædæutic, on the basis of historical and critical scholarship. The success of his *Einführung in das Theologische Studium* proved the wide-felt need of a book dealing with vital problems and constructive principles, rather than presenting dogmatic information.

A similar service has now been rendered English readers by Editor G. B. Smith and his distinguished coworkers. Their labor will make it a less impertinent, and more possible, task to teach propædæutics in theological seminaries. Beginners will find this volume one of the few indispensable tools of a theological student. Pastors, by means of it, can keep abreast with their time. This guide will put a seminary at their fingers' end. It should find a welcome, also, in the homes of intelligent Christian laymen, as a book that reveals the inner spirit of many of the leaders of the Church of Christ in our day, and that summons men to cherish noble convictions, grounded in life and in logic, concerning the "faith which was once for all delivered to the saints," and to attempt constructive work in the Christian Church for the social redemption of mankind. Last, but not least, one longs to see such

a volume as this put into the hands of college men seeking vocational guidance. The work of a Christian minister and the meaning of the theological curriculum, as here presented, are an imperative challenge to the mental vigor, the moral idealism, and the heroic spirit of our academic youth.

It is with special pleasure that the reviewer earnestly recommends this notable work of American scholars to the readers of the *REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW*.

THEODORE F. HERMAN.

PROBLEMS OF RELIGION. An Introductory Survey. By Durant Drake, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy at Vassar College. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. Pp. vii + 425. Price \$2 postpaid.

This book consists of lectures given to undergraduates of Wesleyan University. They cover a wide field. In three parts, the author discusses historical, psychological, and philosophical problems of religion. Each part ends with a concise summary. Carefully selected lists of readings are appended to each of the twenty-five chapters.

The value of a volume like this, which aims to survey so wide a field in so limited a space, must be sought in its general trend, rather than in its definite conclusions; in the spirit and ability which the author brings to his task, more than in the solution of problematical questions; in its constructive lines and comprehensive outlines of thought, and not in complete programs. Thus judged, the book takes a high rank, and merits the attention of those who are interested in the vital problems of religion. Teachers, especially, should acquaint themselves with its contents, which present an excellent survey of a field in which orientation is difficult. Even the conclusions of the author, though advanced beyond the pale of denominational theology, never lack cogency. Nor are they incompatible with a sturdy Christian faith. Here, however, there is ample room for divergent opinions, though the dissenting reader will not find it easy to escape the logic of the author's close reasoning.

But the supreme value of the book consists in the spirit pervading every chapter. It is critical, without being coldly intellectual; scientific, and yet positive; faithful to historical and psychological fact, without being hostile to faith. Scientists should read it for its fine discernment of spiritual values; and theologians should study it for its sound attitude towards historical investigation and scientific conclusions. The author has succeeded admirably in balancing respect for truth and reverence for religion in his treatment of problems in which one or the other frequently suffers loss. He sets fundamental religious truths into a wider perspective, but they gain in reasonable persuasiveness what they seem to lose of their former definiteness. After pe-

rusing the book, faith in the Christian religion is not quite so "smug" and comfortable a matter, but vastly more comforting, both in its foundations and in its superstructure.

The book is written in rare style—lucid, virile, crisp. The reader is carried, without seeming effort, into the depths of great problems by the smooth, swift current of the author's English. This volume is heartily recommended to those who seek a reasonable basis for the faith that is in them, and to those who long for a steady flame to illuminate the modern world of science.

THEODORE F. HERMAN.

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK. By Melancthon W. Jacobus, D.D., of the Hartford Theological Seminary. New York: The Macmillan Company.

We have here an excellent little commentary on the earliest of our Gospels. It belongs to "The Bible for Home and School" series, edited by Professor Shailer Mathews, of Chicago University. It fills a real need in our popular biblical literature, and may be safely commended to all families and schools. Especially will Sunday-school teachers find it a valuable help.

The general purpose of this entire series is "to place the results of the best modern biblical scholarship at the disposal of the general reader." To this purpose the commentary before us is true. Without going into details of critical study, it gives the assured results of such study in a form which the reader, who is unskilled in technical study, can readily follow and understand. The introduction, which fills 33 pages, is excellent; and, without being weighed down with technical details, it gives the reader just such information concerning the origin, composition and history of the Gospel, as a faithful Sunday-school teacher should have. So the notes are free from exegetical processes; and yet they are sufficiently full to enable the reader to gain an insight into the meaning of the text.

Like the rest of the volumes of the series, which have already appeared, the volume before us moves on a high plane of scholarship. It performs a great service to the average reader of the New Testament in placing before him in a readable form the assured results of the best modern biblical scholarship. We think it one of the best in the series thus far published. While intended for the non-technical reader, the volume will be a helpful aid for the student who may lay more claim to critical scholarship.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF THE REV. JOHN PHILIP BOEHM, FOUNDER OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN PENNSYLVANIA. Edited by the Rev. William J. Hinke, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Semitic Languages and Religions in Auburn Theological Seminary. Published by the Publication and Sunday School Board of The Reformed Church in the United States, Philadelphia, Pa. 501 pages. Price \$2.00.

The Reformed Church in the United States owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Hinke for editing this volume. It is a distinct contribution to the literature of the denomination. The task was well worth doing. Anyone who has given serious study to the history of the Reformed Church in the United States will realize how scant the material has been for reconstructing the life and history of the church in colonial times. It is true we have had for some time the benefit of the manuscripts of Dr. Mayer and of the correspondence collected by Dr. Harbaugh as well as the archives of the Dutch Reformed Church in this country. But with it all the whole period of the eighteenth century was exceedingly vague until more recent times. Our historical material for the study of the Reformed Churches of colonial days has been amazingly increased by the invaluable labors and sacrifices and researches in Europe of the late Henry S. Dotterer, the Rev. Dr. James I. Good, and Prof. William J. Hinke. The Publication of the "Minutes and Letters of the Cœtus of Pennsylvania" cleared up our history during the forty-five years of its existence from 1747 to 1792. But meanwhile the period antedating 1750 was exceedingly hazy. Individual congregational records had been lost. Many churches were mistaken in their claims as to the date of their origin. Frequently preposterous claims were put forward without any authentic facts on which to build them. The volume before us helps marvelously in clearing up many facts in the pre-cœtal period of the Reformed Church. In other words it has added twenty-five years of definite data and reliable information to the history of the Reformed Church in the United States. This indeed was a task well worth doing.

Again, it is a task well done. The author follows the methods of the modern scientific historian. By this we mean that his conclusions are based upon documentary evidence, and that the volume contains in itself a transcription of a great deal of original material. It is not simply a fresh combination of known historical facts. It is a "Quellenbuch." The importance of this fact can easily be seen if we bear in mind that the historian must work with documents. They are practically the only visible traces of the thoughts and actions of men of former times. Without documents the past of any period is destined to remain largely unknown. Where there are no documents, there is practically no history. Or rather the period is lost for history. It is as though it had never been. The value of the work before us consists primarily in the fact that it contains the correspondence and

reports of John Philip Boehm, the founder of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania, gathered from the archives of Europe and translated and edited by Dr. Hinke. The correspondence of Boehm printed in this volume covers the period from 1728 to 1749. It is a treasure-house of information as far as the colonial period of the Reformed Church in the United States is concerned.

This volume, however, contains not only the letters and reports of the founder of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania; it also contains a splendidly written account of the life of the Rev. John Philip Boehm himself. In this biography Dr. Hinke has made use of a great deal of the original material which he himself has gathered and translated. Such a detailed biography of Boehm would simply have been impossible a decade ago. When the late Dr. J. H. Dubbs wrote his *Narrative and Critical History of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania* all the available facts in regard to Boehm could be put into less than five pages. Dr. Hinke has given us in this volume a life of Boehm covering one hundred and fifty pages, each of which is filled with authentic facts gathered from every possible source in Europe and America. We beg to congratulate him upon the thoroughness and accuracy of his work. The book will add greatly to our heritage of history in the Reformed Church.

One of the most valuable features of the book is a map of Pennsylvania drawn by Mr. Hinke showing the location of the German Reformed churches organized before the year 1750. That map alone is worth the price of the book to anyone who is interested in the colonial history of the Reformed Church. It requires little imagination on the part of the reader to realize what an enormous amount of work was required on the part of the author before a map of this kind could be formulated with any degree of accuracy.

The preface to the volume is written by Rev. John Baer Stoudt, chairman of the Committee of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church, by whose authorization this volume has been issued. A book of this kind helps us to appreciate and to comprehend the marvellous making of our church; what heroic souls were willing to risk for her defense; what consecration and labors and sacrifices the pioneers of our commonwealth entered upon in order to uphold and enrich the faith of our fathers. We commend this volume heartily to the readers of *THE REVIEW*, and hope sincerely that it will have the wide distribution and the high appreciation which it so well deserves.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE FOLKLORE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA GERMANS. By Rev. John Baer Stoudt. Published by William J. Campbell, Philadelphia. Pages 155.

This volume is a reprint in book form of a paper read before the Pennsylvania-German Society at the annual meeting held in

York, Pennsylvania, on October 14, 1910, and subsequently published as a part of Volume XXIII of the *Proceedings* of that Society.

The study of folklore in any of its varied forms is exceedingly fascinating. An intimate knowledge of the traditions, proverbial sayings, popular beliefs and practices of any people is a great help in understanding the history and development of that people. The material of folk study is as old as history itself. Homer and the Old Testament are rich in lore. Herodotus was the father of folk study as well as of history. But while the material may be very old, the idea of folk study as an independent science is considerably more recent. It was not much before the eighteenth century that the English began to collect their lore. In more recent times Irish and Scotch literature and history have been greatly benefited by the fact that farsighted men recognized the charm and significance of the customs, ceremonies, proverbs and legends of their own people. Antiquities relating to church festivals, marriage customs, burial ceremonies, fireside amusements, superstitions and vulgar errors, dreams, nursery rhymes, prayers and riddles, ballads and formulas, have all been found helpful in reconstructing the life and history of a people. In Germany the Grimm brothers have made the folklore of the Teutonic race a matter of scientific study. They have showed that the nursery tales which delight the German children of modern days can be traced back through the centuries to primæval times. The work of the Grimm brothers was inspired by a noble patriotism. All their investigations of early German household tales, legends and poetry, were inseparably connected with their Fatherland and were calculated to foster a love of it.

What these and many other writers have done for their respective people, the author of this volume has done for his own people. The Pennsylvania Germans have made a distinct, valuable, and permanent contribution to American civilization. They have a history that has entwined itself into the whole fabric of American social, economic, political and religious life. The Pennsylvania-German Society has done a splendid work for a number of years in the way of investigating and preserving the facts of that history; and the author of this volume has had no small part in helping to bring to light many facts that will be of value in helping to reconstruct the domestic and religious life of the Pennsylvania German people.

In the volume before us, the author shows that the early German settlers in Pennsylvania had certain characteristic traditions and sayings, but that on American soil these traditions, proverbs, rhymes, and ballads were given new settings and applications. For fifteen years the author gathered material for the pages of this book. In a splendidly written Introduction he says: "My pur-

pose in this work is neither critical nor apologetic, but rather historical and pictorial; hoping on the one hand to record before the oblivious night sets in, what is still obtainable of the folklore of my own people, and on the other hand to execute pen pictures of their inner life, in their own words and thought forms." He has gathered interesting and valuable material, illustrative of the prayers, the lullabies, the counting rhymes, the powwowing formulas, the riddles and catches, the greetings and the ballads of the people of eastern Pennsylvania. He has given a comparative presentation of these rhymes by referring them to the county or the particular locality in which they are found. This comparative element in the book is a feature that will enable the reader to see what dialectic changes have taken place in what is after all a very limited territory. The explanatory notes of the author and his many comments on more or less obscure rhymes are exceedingly helpful and illuminating. We beg to congratulate him on the work. It was worth doing, and it has been well done. As one penetrates by means of these pages into the inner life of his own ancestors, watches their pure customs, sees their hearty faith, listens to their quaint and rugged forms of expression, he comes to feel that the study of folklore is meant to do more than simply to satisfy curiosity. It has in it elements of scientific worth and is calculated to foster in a man a love of "mine own people."

The book is beautifully printed, a number of carefully selected wood-cuts add greatly to the general appearance of the volume, the author adds a fine human touch to one of his paragraphs by paying a sincere and well deserved tribute to the memory of the late Dr. Joseph Henry Dubbs. All who were fortunate enough to have been in his class-room can readily see how the inspiration for the writing of this volume came to the author through the enthusiasm of that delightful teacher.

We take pleasure in commending the volume to the readers of the *REVIEW* as well as to all others who may be interested in the history and traditions, the beliefs and practices of the Pennsylvania German people.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE FORKS OF THE ROAD. By Washington Gladden. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pages 138. Price 50 cents.

This book was awarded the thousand dollar prize offered by the Church Peace Union for the best essay on War and Peace. The book discusses the problem of the coexistence of war and the Christian civilization of today. Dr. Gladden shows that all the nations that are at war today have ideals of peace and are really aiming at a permanent settlement. He contends that the law of love will ultimately govern man's relations. This end, he contends, can be best promoted by the absolute abandonment of

armament. He therefore calls upon America to give up its preparedness program and to follow insistently the policy of the pacifist. In the establishment of this policy the Church must take the lead.

He calls the present war "the scandal of the centuries." He shows that the organic law of human society lies in the spirit of mutual coöperation. This law Christianity emphasizes. The trouble is that the spirit of the Anti-Christ has in the past few decades placed industry, politics and war outside of the pale of Christian ethics. Industry, as at present organized, he says is on an Anti-Christian basis. It is a species of warfare contravening the principle of mutual service. Of party politics the same may be said. It is confessedly warfare. Parties are organized to cripple each other. The most powerful realm however of the Kingdom of Anti-Christ is in international relationships. Here the principle holds

"The good old rule, the simple plan,
That he should get who has the power;
And he should keep who can."

He quotes Bernardi, as saying that "the law of Christian morality can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another." Civilization is paying the price of that Anti-Christian doctrine.

The nations are at the forks of the road. Where is the church, is the question Dr. Gladden raises. Is it a negligible quantity, or is it asserting itself for Christian ideals? What of the central doctrine of human brotherhood? Has not the church too come to the forks of the road? The author of this book makes a strong plea for the church to come back to the simplicity that was in Christ, and he challenges the leaders of the church of our day to take the great central truth of the Divine Fatherhood and human Brotherhood, and make these the heart of her teaching and the inspiration of her life.

The book is written in Dr. Gladden's best style, and has in it something of the stern ring of the prophet. It contains a message that will make them think. Its timeliness is apparent. When the nations of the earth begin to wake up to a realizing sense of their folly in the calmer days that will follow the present whirlwind, the high idealism of this book will doubtless be more appreciated than it is in these feverish days. There is no reason however why the church of Jesus Christ should not be the first to see the truth of the gospel so fearlessly proclaimed by Dr. Gladden, and why the leaders of the American Church at least should not do all in their power even now—especially now—to bring about the new day of peace which is bound to come if there is any import in the phrase "The Kingdom of heaven is here."

Dr. Gladden's book will be an inspiration to many readers who are perplexed by the coexistence of world war and so-called Christian civilization. The author does not solve the problem, but he does show the lines along which the problem will and must ultimately find its only permanent solution. We commend his book heartily to the readers of the REVIEW.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

HEROINES OF HISTORY. By Frank M. Bristol, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: The Abingdon Press. Pages 290. Price \$1.00 net.

The author, now a bishop in Nebraska, is most widely known as having been pastor of the Metropolitan Church, Washington, in the days when President McKinley was an attendant. The readers of the REVIEW know him best perhaps by his volume on *The Religious Instinct of Man*, one of the series in "The Methodist Pulpit."

The present volume is an attempt to interpret the typical heroines of mythology, of Shakespeare and of the Bible. From the Old Greek traditions he takes Thetis, Hecuba and Latone as examples of the heroine mother; Antigone and Iphigenia as ideals of the heroine daughter; Andromache, Alcestis and Penelope as typifying the devotion of a faithful wife.

Among the female characters of Shakespeare he selects and discusses with fine insight the characters of Miranda and Cordelia as examples of the heroine qualities possible in a daughter, and pays high tribute to Constance and Volumnia for proofs of a royal mother love. He shows that the most interesting characters in Shakespeare's dramas are wives. In Portia he finds a representative heroine-wife, in Lady Macbeth a case of misjudged devotion, in Imogen "the best beloved in all the world of song and tide of time."

Among the Hebrew women of Old Testament literature, he finds a type of character in woman as mother, wife, and daughter, superior to that of the women in Greek and English literature. In a final chapter he pays a eulogistic tribute to Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and finds in her the supreme woman heroine. As a comparative study of the place and work of women in Classical, Elizabethan and Biblical times, the book is interesting, but nowhere would we say has it qualities that really grip the soul. The author undoubtedly knows literature thoroughly and understands life fully, but he fails to link the elements of literature and life in a way that will readily give effective as well as attractive qualities to his book.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

RECOVERED YESTERDAYS IN LITERATURE. By William A. Quayle. New York: The Abingdon Press. Pages 306. Price \$1.50 net.

Bishop Quayle of Minnesota is known in the Methodist Episcopal Church as the Poet-Preacher. He has written at least a score of books in verse and prose, all of them characterized by a fine appreciation of the best in nature, art and literature. The volume before us is the most recent production from the heart and mind of this prolific and inspiring writer. It is a series of charming essays on men, women and literature. The author devotes two interesting chapters to "Shakespeare's Men" and "Tennyson's Men"; two delightful chapters to Francis Thompson, and Charles Lamb. A number of pages treat of the Literature of Nature and the Literature of Devotion.

The object of the author is not to produce a series of critical essays, but rather to record the result of his thoughts, reflections and experiences in the field of study and teaching. He has the gift not so much of imparting information as of delineating in a delightful manner the personality of certain representative minds of literature. A part of the volume is given to reminiscences and reflections on a number of books read by the author. Not the least of the merits of these pages consists in the fact that they relate the wide reading of a passionate lover of literature and the common experiences of life of a recognized moral and spiritual leader to the problem of efficient living. We are sure the book will prove to be helpful and delightful reading to all who are interested in wholesome literature.

H. M. J. KLEIN.